The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1896.

The Week.

WE have escaped from what a large number of people supposed was an immense danger, the danger of having our currency adulterated and our form of government changed, and a band of ignoramuses and Anarchists put at the head of what remained of the great American republic. Probably no man in civil life has succeeded in inspiring so much terror, without taking life, as Bryan. Attila and Tamerlane frightened more people, but they killed or threatened to kill them; they hardly destroyed more property. Bryan succeeded in persuading hundreds of thousands that the great fabric of government which was built up by the wisdom and experience of a thousand years, and cemented by hundreds of thousands of lives, was, almost in the first century of its existence, about to be handed over by the vote of its own people to a knot of silly, half-taught adventurers and Anarchists. We were to exchange the Constitution and the Supreme Court for the decrees of Altgeld and Debs and Bryan and Teller, whose principal occupation was to be striking off "cheap money for the poor man." The whole episode has been utterly discreditable to our politics, as conducted by politicians. Could anything better reveal the character of our nominating system than the fact that the nominating convention of one of our two great parties could be taken possession of by a few adventurers, that the platform could be drawn, in the main, by a noted Anarchist, and an unknown young man nominated on it simply because the audience was pleased with one of his metaphors, and that it should drive away from it all the party's men of light and leading before going to the country?

There is nothing partisan about the overwhelming majorities for McKinley. It was not the Republican party which won; it was the cause of the nation. In Connecticut, for example, the returns show that in a total vote about the same as four years ago McKinley's plurality is about 48,000, against about 5,000 for Cleveland in 1892, because one-third of those who supported the Democratic candidate then supported the Republican candidate now. It was not that they had become Republicans, but that they had repudiated a false Democracy in the only effective way, by voting for the only man who could defeat Bryan. The Palmer vote is insignificant, not because the men who believe in the Indianapolis platform are few, but because most of them followed the virtual advice of Palmer himself to support McKinley. One of his last deliverances was this, at Warrensburg, Mo., on Saturday: "I promise you, my fellow-Democrats, I will not consider it any very great fault if you decide next Tuesday to cast your ballots for William McKinley, although you may, if you desire, vote for Palmer and Buckner."

A popular revolution such as occurred on Tuesday almost invariably involves the control of Congress, and the rule will undoubtedly hold this time. The Republicans have carried the House of Representatives by a great majority, the only question being whether they will have a full two-thirds of the body. The gains of seats in the Senate now held by Democrats or Populists in Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kansas, South Dakota, and perhaps other States will give the Republicans also nearly, if not quite, a majority in the upper branch of men who have always been advocates of sound money. Moreover, the overwhelming rejection of the free-coinage policy will unquestionably lead some of the Republican Senators from the far West who have hitherto stood by the silver cause, to abandon it now. There is no reason to doubt that, if the McKinley Administration will formulate a sound financial policy, there will be Republicans enough in each branch of Congress to sanction it. That policy was distinctly outlined in the Indianapolis platform, and will be the touchstone of Republican non-partisanship.

The fusion campaign for the Presidency closed with an exchange of abusive epithets between the Populist and the Democratic wings of the "allied forces." Many "life-long Democrats" were overflowing with indignation at the impudence of Populist upstarts, like Senator Butler of North Carolina, in declaring that "they have taken possession of the Democratic party," and that "the Democrats have, in the broad sense of the word, become Populists." On the other hand, many honest and sincere men, who had worked for years to build up the Populist party as an effective political organization, were equally outraged at what they considered the "sell-out" to the Democrats by traders of the Butler school. The result was that, during the last days of the canvass, the movement away from Bryan among adherents of the old-fashioned Democratic party was accelerated, while another movement was taking from him Populists who found that they could not stomach the dose prepared by the fusion doctors. The history of such movements has shown that fusions never really fuse. In Oregon, for example, four years ago, the Populists polled 26,965 votes for two Weaver electors, and the Democrats 14,243 for one Cleveland elector—a total of 41,208 for the two parties; but the one elector who was supported by both received only 35,813 votes. The difficulties of fusion on a Presidential ticket, with two candidates for Vice-President, were infinitely greater.

There never was a Presidential campaign in which one of the two great parties received so little support from the press of the country as was given the fusionists this year. Every independent journal in the United States was opposed to Bryan, and throughout the East all the old established and influential Democratic newspapers were outspoken against him. In the Western metropolis he got as little backing from the press as in the Eastern, not one Chicago journal of the first class advocating free coinage, and hardly any of the lower classes. The chief Democratic newspaper of Michigan was bitterly opposed to Populism, and so likewise was that of Minnesota. Even in the South the revolt of the party press against the surrender to Populism was pronounced. The Louisville *Courier-Journal* and the other most prominent Democratic newspapers in Kentucky were earnestly opposed to Bryan; the same is true of the Montgomery *Advertiser*, the chief party organ in Alabama, and of the Galveston-Dallas *News*, the most influential newspaper in Texas. Many of those papers which nominally favored Bryan rendered him an entirely perfunctory support, and condemned the campaign made in his behalf. The *Florida Citizen*, for example, remarked that "the effort to make the present political campaign one of the poor against the rich, and to cause the South and the West to combine against the East, is one that no wise man in the South can approve." The Mobile *Register* went so far as to say that it believed Bryan's policy would ruin the country, but that it did not believe he would carry out his policy if he should be elected.

We think that the world has never before witnessed the spectacle of an immense number of people drawing gold out of solvent banks and locking it up lest the value of their money should be reduced one-half by the result of an election—this, too, in a time of profound peace. As election day drew nearer, this movement became more pronounced, causing unexpected tightness in the money market. On Thursday, call money touched 100 per cent., and it loaned at that rate again on the following day. It is the estimate of good judges that $40,000,000 was thus hoarded, most of it during the past thirty days. Fortunately this came at a time when the international move-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of gold was in our favor; when, too, speculation was at the lowest ebb, so that holders of securities were not likely to be "squeezed out." It is fortunate also that the banking community realized the ephemeral character of the spasm, and consequently felt justified in extending aid to the mercantile community beyond the ordinary bounds of safety. The feeling in commercial circles found expression on the Montreal Stock Exchange, where certain shares were quoted "cum McKinley." Thus, sales of Commercial Cable were quoted in the Montreal *Herald* of October 29 at 146½ for present delivery, and at 151 for delivery after November 3, if McKinley should be elected. Postal Telegraph shares were quoted at 80½ regular and at 83 "cum McKinley."

Among the humorous features of the late campaign a high rank belongs to Henry George's series of letters carrying one State after another for Bryan in a long succession, beginning with those in the Mississippi valley and working East. A few days ago he reached the boundaries of New York, and began operations with the naïve announcement that he had discovered in western New York "the same indications of silver's victory as he found further West." He summed up the outlook, as viewed from the metropolis, in "the only conclusion I can come to from such information as I have been able to obtain, that Bryan and Sewall, and not McKinley and Hobart, will carry the State of New York." Bryan himself set the pace for Populistic prophets when he said a fortnight ago: "I expect to carry every State in the Union. You should have seen the crowd at Boston. It was a most remarkable demonstration."

The address signed last week by Messrs. Arthur, Sargent, and Arnold, the leaders of the locomotive engineers and firemen, declaring that "under a condition of free coinage this country would be subjected to one of the most frightful panics that any country in this world has ever seen," was a very important deliverance. It not only emphasized a great financial truth, but pointed to a line of cleavage in the ranks of labor which the events of this campaign have signalized in a striking manner—the line between the constructive and the destructive elements of the wage-working class. The latter class are represented by Debs and Sovereign, and the former by Arthur and Sargent. Debs's method of helping labor is by pulling down, Arthur's by building up. Debs naturally falls into the Bryan campaign because Bryan preaches war between classes. To him "16 to 1" has no meaning whatever; but a license to defy the laws, disobey injunctions, and discipline the courts, as promised in the Chicago platform, is full of significance. Mr. Arthur and his associates find nothing attractive in this programme. Their theory for the advancement of labor is to create, not to destroy capital. They believe that the more property there is in the world the more the wage-worker will get. And as to "16 to 1," they have learned by study and reflection that it means a depreciated dollar, which means less compensation to the men and women who work for hire. They tell us that they were induced to sign some kind of a memorial to Congress three years ago on the subject of bimetallism; that they do not remember exactly what it was. Whatever it was, they say that it was signed without reflection; that they have since studied the matter sufficiently to know that free coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 would be "directly against the interests of labor." They do not believe that the country can endure the present misery and distress four years longer, and for that reason they are "emphatically and unequivocally against any such measure, and are for the sound-money plank promulgated by the Republican convention at St. Louis."

Speaker Reed adds his name to the list of distinguished Republicans who confess that the silver-purchase act of 1890 was the price paid for the McKinley tariff act of 1890. In his article in the current *Forum* he explains the defeat of his party in the congressional elections of 1890 by saying that the tariff bill was delayed so long by the silver Senators. "We had been sacrificed to silver," he says. This is no doubt the truth, but it comes grotesquely from one of the head sacrificers. Mr. Reed knew all about the wicked bargain at the time, and had it in his power to frustrate the whole wretched intrigue. Yet he struck hands with the men who were sacrificing the party to silver, and defended their work on the stump all over the country. More than this, he himself, with the help of the precious Lodge, brought out in 1894 his ridiculous but reckless scheme to sacrifice the party all over again to silver. But now Lodge is going about with a pious roll to his eyes asserting that the people have been "misled" on the silver question, and Speaker Reed closes his article with a high moral rebuke to the silver Senators. Faugh! as the *Tribune* used to say when confronted with a peculiarly sickening exhibition of Mugwump hypocrisy.

The utter subsidence of the Venezuelan excitement is a good instance of the way political issues burn themselves to ashes in this country and cannot be rekindled. Less than a year ago people were convulsed at the name of Schomburgk, and grew apoplectic at the very mention of the Cuyuni River. Now they have reached a degree of indifference to the whole subject like that of Archbishop Magee, on a certain occasion, when he said that a curate might safely play with him. Sir Edward Clarke has come out in a public speech and intimated that the English case is all a sham, but not a quiver of an eyelid did he excite in this country. Our Commission's experts have come back from delving in the archives at The Hague, and not a newspaper correspondent has thought it worth while to read in their faces that it is all up with Salisbury and that there will be a war next spring. Weariness of the whole question is all that can be discovered on every side. Nor is this entirely due to our having more pressing affairs on hand. We feel that we have gone through our Venezuelan heroics and explosions for good and all. Our capacities in that line are thoroughly exhausted. Ask us to be hysterical about something else, and we will do our best to accommodate you; but Venezuela—no more of that.

"An appointment not fit to be made." That historic phrase is justly applicable to the selection by Gov. Morton of Jake Worth, the Republican boss of Brooklyn, as County Clerk of Kings County, to fill the vacancy caused by the recent death of the incumbent. This appointment will hold until the beginning of 1897, when the new Governor chosen on Tuesday must make an appointment to last until the Legislature shall take action for the holding of an election. Jake Worth has long been notorious as a perfect type of the professional politician, who is "in politics for what he can make out of it," and who has a supreme contempt for "snivel-service reform" and officials of the type of Seth Low, whose nomination and election as mayor he bitterly opposed. A fellow-workman in the navy-yard with Hugh McLaughlin, the Democratic boss, when both were young men, he has often worked hand-in-glove with him in later years, and his appointment, by a mayor who was a tool of McLaughlin, as an election commissioner to represent the Republican party a few years ago was universally recognized as a gross outrage upon the spirit of the law and the proprieties of the situation. The plea is put forward that "of late years no one has had any good reason to question the loyalty of Mr. Worth's Republicanism, and his counsels have been followed to good advantage in many critical junctures," but he is still a man of the same character that he was when his "loyalty" was questioned. While Gov. Morton is primarily responsible for this appointment, announcement is officially made from Albany that it was recommended by Frank S. Black, who is expected to reappoint Worth upon his accession to the governorship on the 1st of January; by Timothy L. Woodruff, Lieutenant-Governor elect; by Judges Dickey and Goodrich of the Supreme Court; by Mayor Wurster; by Benjamin F. Tracy, Stewart L. Woodford, and other men of the highest standing in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor's party. Indeed, Mr. Morton may well plead that, in making this ad-interim appointment, he has only recorded the wish of the Republican party in Brooklyn as expressed by its foremost representatives, and of the State leader selected by the Republican party of the commonwealth. Really the most disheartening aspect of the matter is the revelation that the Jake Worth sort of politician secures recognition from the next Governor even before his election. We had hoped for better things from Mr. Black.

Comptroller Fitch kept this whole city in confusion, and kept a contractor out of his money lawfully due to him, for many days, simply, he says, because he got it into his head that the contractor's men engaged in collecting pieces of paper ought to be examined under the civil-service rules. The Corporation Counsel says there is nothing in this, and thereupon Mr. Fitch declares he is satisfied, and he will pay the money. But he might just as well have started, out of his own head, the opinion that the contractor's men must be all Protestants, and have taken the Corporation Counsel's opinion on that. There is no end to the foolish notions which a man careless of the public interests might not use as an excuse for not doing his duty by them. One of the Comptroller's first duties, towering above even his duty to be honest, is not to be silly, if it causes inconvenience to other people, though at home in his own house he may be as silly as he pleases. A moment's reflection on the civil-service law by anybody above the age of ten would show him that the civil-service law was not intended for private employees; and all employees of a man who is personally responsible for the results of their work, are private employees. How we wish Mr. Fitch would grow up, and learn that the road to glory in this community now is to facilitate, not to hinder, the policing, lighting, paving, and cleaning of the city.

The Overseers of Harvard University have not adopted the full recommendation of their Committee on Composition and Rhetoric. That is, they have not made a certain proficiency in English a condition of admission. They have simply approved of the course pursued by the Faculty and recommended its continuance. Still, the resolution of the Board will be found pretty drastic by the schools. It says:

"Voted, that, in the judgment of the Board of Overseers, every candidate for admission to the undergraduate departments of the university should give evidence that he can write the English language with such degree of neatness and skill in penmanship, correctness in spelling and grammar, and with such facility of expression as will enable him to enter, without further elementary instruction, on the elective studies to which he proposes to devote himself, including the more advanced courses in English composition; voted, that the Faculty be requested to press steadily towards the attainment of the above end."

The main effect of this will be to increase the importance of English and cause more attention to be given to it. The difficulty has largely arisen out of the fact that the old oral system of instruction in English at Harvard has been abandoned under President Eliot for the written, but the schools still prepare for the oral, and we know the result.

The news that Bismarck had a secret defensive treaty with Russia from 1884 to 1890 seems to be authentic. His personal organ affirms it, and the official mouthpiece of the Government refuses either to affirm or deny it, though practically affirming it by a severe comment on the enormity of a betrayal of such high state secrets. That Bismarck should have been capable of thus cutting under the Dreibund, about which at the time he was making such a flourish, ought not to surprise those acquainted with the professed cynicism of his theory of diplomacy. The wide reverberations of the disclosure show into what a state of nervous tension the European Powers have got themselves. Each new "European concert," in fact, seems to mean fresh international suspicion and jealousy, as if the participants in the concert were so many irritable musicians playing out of tune and doing their best to smash each other's instruments. Many things account for this condition of international nervousness, not the least of them being the strain of matching army with army and fleet with fleet. If you are bound to keep yourself stronger than an unmannerly neighbor, every step he takes to strengthen himself necessarily makes you fretful and angry. Then there is, as the *Economist* remarks, the tendency to exaggerate everything that any statesman or semi-official newspaper says, through forgetting how they must say something whether they have anything to say or not. Lord Salisbury must speak at the Guildhall banquet next week, however much he might prefer to keep still. He will also be bound to maintain that England was never greater, English diplomacy never so skilful and successful, and everything never so likely to turn out as he wants it. Careful consideration of this compulsion under which he labors should always be present in interpreting his language. Then, as for the press, it is one of its old failings to be most furious when most empty.

Mr. Curzon made a long speech in Glasgow on foreign affairs on the 14th, and it was expected in some quarters that he, as Under-Secretary and Salisbury's mouthpiece in the Commons, would hint at the line the Government proposes to take in the Armenian business. But he did nothing of the kind. What he had to say only went to confirm the fling at him in which Mr. Bowles indulged in the House of Commons one day, when he reminded some baffled inquirers that Mr. Curzon was put up, not to reveal Lord Salisbury's thoughts and intentions, but to conceal, so far as possible, Lord Salisbury's lack of thoughts and intentions. In defence of the Government's inaction, Mr. Curzon could only say that the concert of Europe was a great and solemn object of worship, that England would never be justified in doing anything for the Armenians and thereby infuriating the other Powers into falling upon her tooth and nail, and that slow methods—much letter-writing, and long waiting for answers—were of the very essence of diplomacy. But let the country not despair. In Lord Salisbury the country had "a minister of unequalled experience in foreign affairs." He was, in fact, "the *doyen* of the corps of European statesmen." Could such a doyen make a mistake? People talked of renewed massacres, asked what was England's navy doing, were in a hurry for some sort of positive action. Mr. Curzon begged them not to distrust the doyen; if you cannot repose confidence in him, whom can you trust?

There is reason to believe that among the persons surprised at the choice of the Bishop of London as Archbishop of Canterbury was the Bishop himself. He issued to his clergy, soon after Dr. Benson's death, a special prayer for divine guidance in the selection of a new Primate, which certainly did not look as if he dreamed of the appointment's coming his way. Then he delivered, on October 22, an address, on church reform, which was pretty radical for one of the higher clergy. He spoke strongly against the scandal of advowsons, or the sale of livings in the church, one-third to one-half of which he said were frequently in the market to be knocked down to the highest bidder. Dr. Temple also expressed sympathy with what he asserted to be a widespread feeling, that parishioners ought to have a voice in the appointment of their ministers—at least to the extent of keeping out clergymen not fit for their work. Another grave defect in the machinery of the church, argued the (then) Bishop, was the lack of any way of removing incompetent clergymen. He was willing to draw a distinction between those who were incompetent through no fault of their own, and those whose incompetence arose from the fact that they would not work. To throw the former upon the poor-rates would be a serious scandal; the latter really ought to be sent to the workhouse, the future Archbishop intimated. The significant thing is, that Dr. Temple is not the kind of man to change his opinions through promotion, and that the English movement for church reform may therefore count upon active support from the new official head of the church.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDUCATION OF THE CONSCIENCE.

MANY a time during the past few months have those whose happiness is bound up in the honor of their country longed for the sound of voices that are now silent. Strong and earnest voices we have indeed heard in numbers, voices that we could have ill spared and that have been raised in righteous indignation and soul-stirring eloquence. But it is impossible for those whose memories run backward for a generation not to miss the inspiration that came from the utterances of great men who are no longer with us. Their fame was so widespread as to carry the influence of their teachings throughout the length and breadth of the land, and their personal power gave an effect to their arguments far greater than the same arguments can have in the mouths of men less widely known.

Fortunately these voices, although silent, yet speak to us from the records of the past. We know what Webster said concerning the attempt to array the poor against the rich. We know what Curtis said when a policy of dishonor seemed likely to find favor with the multitude. We can read the fiery utterances of Lowell as he looked across the ocean at "the land of broken promises." What Beecher thought, Mr. Bryan learned to his discomfiture, when he assured his Brooklyn audience that Beecher if living would be on his side; an appeal as dismal in its results as King Saul's invocation of the spirit of the prophet Samuel. What James Freeman Clarke would have said, the following extract from what he did say nearly twenty years ago sufficiently shows. Every word of it is as apt and true as if spoken to-day. His subject was the education of the conscience, the chief diseases of which he called stupor and ignorance. The conscience, he said, might be inactive or it might be badly instructed. The sins of the time, the crimes against society, the swindling transactions, the defalcations, the betrayals of trust, the repudiation of public obligations, are not usually deliberate violations of what is seen to be right, but rather come from consciences stupefied, sophisticated, and uninstructed. Dr. Clarke continued:

"Take, for example, the proposition made a few years since to pay the national debt in silver, when silver was below par—a plan at one time very popular, and which would have inflicted so much injury on the honor and welfare of the nation, and which would have been a blow to national credit, and the source of disaster. We mistake if we suppose that the people of the West and South were deliberately doing what they knew to be wrong in supporting it. They were misled by artful demagogues. They were taught to believe that, as the letter of the law allowed payment of the early bonds in coin of either kind, there would be no injustice in paying them in a depreciated currency. They were persuaded that the demonetization of silver was a cunning trick of rich bondholders, done in order to oppress the poor, and that the people had been defrauded thus of the money which would give new activity to business and furnish employment to thousands. But when they were taught that this was all false, and that the plan was in the interest of speculators; when they saw that it would be defrauding every man who had any money due him of ten cents on a dollar; that it would be cheating the foreign creditors who lent us their money in our war when we needed it to save the nation; that it would be cheating the widows and orphans whose small means were intrusted to the honor of the country: that it would be cheating every farmer out of a tenth part of the price of his wheat, every day-laborer of the tenth part of his day's wages; and all to put more money into the pockets of the rich owners of the silver mines—then the conscience of the land refused to accept such a proposition.

"These truths were taught boldly, plainly, unequivocally, in tones which reached every log cabin beyond the mountains. The people were taught that the collapse of business was the natural result of over-trading, over-investments in costly speculations, and pushing the credit system to an extreme point. They were taught that what we needed for the revival of business was not more money, but more confidence; that there was money enough, but that those who had it would not risk it. They were made to see that confidence comes not by repudiation of debts, not by expansion of the currency, not by trying to cheat creditors, but by exactly the opposite course, and that all these measures would only increase the evils under which we suffered. They saw at last that the remedy for the state of commercial distrust was that each man should learn economy, give up extravagance, quit speculation, do a safe business, pay his debts promptly, and that the Government should lead the way by resuming specie payments; that is, by beginning to pay its honest debts in honest money. As soon as the conscience of the nation was enlightened on such points as these, such a piece of dishonesty as the Bland bill became impossible."

Nothing more appropriate for the present crisis has been uttered by any living man. There is nothing to add to it, nothing to subtract from it. It is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The principles of right and wrong are immutable; the sophistical pleas of demagogues change their form, but they too remain essentially the same. They consist in appeals to the baser passions of mankind. They seek to arouse hatred and envy and cupidity and revenge. They excuse dishonesty on the ground that dishonesty has existed, and propose to defraud creditors of the present day because, as they claim, debtors were defrauded in 1873. We may fairly say that during the last few months correct views of political morality have been fully presented to the people. The truth has been "taught boldly, plainly, unequivocally," and no one who could read or hear has needed to remain unenlightened. There is no excuse for the disease of ignorance or the disease of stupor. Never was an appeal made more directly to the consciences of the people, never were more votes determined to be cast by conscientious voters.

MR. MORETON FREWEN.

WE make this gentleman a subject because he is just now doing, in our opinion, a great deal of international mischief. The only reason we can think of why the London *Times* should make him the chief explainer of America to England, instead of leaving the work to its own correspondent, is that, having once lived in this country, he is supposed to know it from the English point of view, and to be ready to speak of it in a way which might not be expected from a man who lived here still. Mr. Frewen has had a ranch in the West in which he failed, has since then been in rather embarrassed circumstances, and is extremely fond of writing about America in the English papers, displaying in all his writings a large amount of inaccuracy, misinformation, credulity, and want of judgment. After saying this we need hardly add that he is an ardent bimetallist, and has a high opinion of all bimetallists, and thinks something dreadful will happen if we do not all become bimetallists. He has contracted, too, the bimetallic affection for Silver, and has measurably succeeded in personifying it, and devotes a large proportion of his waking hours and literary capacities to glorifying it. The Bryan movement, having so much silver in it, is therefore exceedingly grateful to him, as it seems to be a fulfilment of his own prophecies. One of the most striking effects of bimetallism on the mind is the prophetic spirit with which it fills its votaries. They are all sure that within, say, ten, if not five, years the whole world will be bimetallic, and that "the ratio"—some ratio—will bring peace into millions of humble homes. The sources from which these predictions occasionally come are often amazing. Men whose judgment one would no more trust about finance than that of Wilkins Micawber, are certain that within a very few years the nations will be tumbling over each other in eagerness to make a bimetallic "international agreement."

Mr. Frewen is aided in his explanations of America to the English people by two things. One is the English disposition, at crises like the present, always to believe that the worst is going to happen to us. This is not unnatural, for we often do act like drunken men until the consequences begin to stare us in the face, and then, just as our ruin seems certain, we suddenly become rational and sober-minded. This tendency to go to the brink of the precipice and then withdraw hastily was evident as early as Tocqueville's day, and is commented on by him in his book. There were several illustrations of it during the war of the rebellion, and it led to the publication in 1861 of one of the oddest of literary products, a book on America by a man named James Spence. He managed to be even more irritating and incompetent than Mr. Frewen, and it would hardly be unfair to hold him responsible for much of the ill feeling between the two countries which lasted down to the conclusion of the *Alabama* treaty. He was a Liverpool merchant who had lived here for some years and had then gone back. His style was good and his octavo was large. He showed how greatly Americans had degenerated since the foundation of the government; how frivolous, fickle, and boastful they were; how difficult it would be to subdue

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the South; how probable it was the attempt would be abandoned in a few months, and how certain it was that the money borrowed for the purpose of making it would never be repaid.

The book's effect was prodigious. It furnished proofs for ideas of America to tens of thousands of good old Tories. They believed all its statements because they seemed to them to be probable. They thought Americans would behave as Spence said they were going to behave, because this was how they were likely to behave. All the newspapers had articles on the book. Citations from it were constant in everything written about America. In fact, during the greater part of 1861 any one who disputed Mr. Spence's authority was "dismissed with a smile." His influence did not begin to decline for a year. Somewhat the same state of things prevails now. It seems extremely likely, after the silver agitation of both parties since 1873, after even McKinley's state of mind during the last ten years, that we should all now, except a few bankers in New York, be furious silverites; and after the Venezuela uproar, and our attempts to go to war with various nations last winter, that we should, with our usual frivolousness, elect a rag-tag young fellow for the Presidency if he promised us all plenty of money and unlimited credit. The whole outlook, as foretold by the judicious Frewen, has fallen in with preconceived ideas.

The second thing which helps him is our press. It is true the bulk of the press, every paper which has much weight or influence, has fiercely opposed Bryanism and predicted Bryan's defeat. But ordinarily our press is boastful in the extreme about the American people and national affairs; it is delighted with the prospect of a war about anything; it is much occupied with crimes and scandals and personal gossip—things which a European thinks very childish and trivial. The consequence is that, at a crisis like this, when events have made it serious, its utterances, as expressions of national feeling, have not their due weight. Poor a reporter as Frewen may be, he seems more reliable than the *Daily Fuz-Buz* or the *Evening Ragpicker*. So Englishmen have gone on believing with the Frewens that Bryan would be elected and that Teller and Altgeld were busy telling the truth. The only thing which could remedy all this was the election. Spence has been dead many years, but he lived to see his book sold to the ragpickers by weight and himself become an object of ridicule. Mr. Frewen will now return to England a quieter, less positive, and possibly wiser man, and will dismiss those who ask him about American politics with a sad bimetallic smile. That smile has ordinarily much pity and contempt in it for the grovelling gold-bug world. Now that Bryan is defeated there will be much deprecation and appeal and resignation in it.

THE BILL TO AUTHORIZE ANARCHY.

We need make no apology for returning more at length to the subject of Senate Bill No. 2984, which is unaffected by the fortunate issue of the election just over. For how can law survive and justice be maintained if that bill passes the House and goes upon the statute-book at the next session? The public can hardly have realized what a weapon of misrule was forged by the Senate when it passed the measure on June 10 last; and the public verdict at the polls leaves untouched the task of preventing any further Congressional action in the spirit of the Chicago platform. The paternity of the bill ought alone to suffice to discredit it. Introduced, in December last, by Populist Peffer, again in another form by Populist Allen, reported from the Judiciary Committee by David B. Hill, and championed in the closing speech by Marion Butler, it was rushed through, without a roll-call, on the day before adjournment, by a quorum hastily got together, of whom one-half had not heard the debate, and the other half had made no pretence of listening. It cannot face the sober consideration of the American people, and its pernicious features need only to be pointed out to insure its condemnation.

The essence of its provisions is to substitute, in the federal courts, a jury for the judge in all cases of "indirect" contempt of court. That is, when an order has been issued by the court, and a certain person is brought before the court for not obeying the order, the question whether he has in fact disobeyed the order—in legal language, the fact of contempt—is not to be investigated and decided (as from time immemorial) by the judge, but by a jury summoned, sitting, and deciding in the usual way of litigation. It is the seeming innocence and plausibility of this proposed innovation that constitutes its vice; for underneath it lie the most far-reaching and disastrous consequences, and the layman is not likely at once to see what these are, and how nearly they touch the security of his person and his property.

What is this "indirect" contempt of court? It is, as every lawyer knows, simply the disobedience of an order of the court. Now, in the great multitude of cases, the order of the court is the ultimate support on which rests all possibility of the practical doing of justice. If, for instance, there is any practical way of evading obedience to such an order, the juryman who is summoned need never come; the man who is ordered to pay us money need never pay; the person who is ordered to transfer a house or a lot, found by a jury to belong to us, need never make the transfer; the designing oppressor who chooses to kidnap and shut another man in his strong room, need never unlock the doors; the public officer who is ordered to disgorge embezzled funds, or to refrain from a usurpation of power, may snap his fingers at the order, and the whole power of enforcing specific redress goes by the board. In short, wherever it is necessary, in order to realize a legal right, that an order of court be issued, the legal right, without the order of court to back it up, remains a mere matter of vain theory to its possessor.

Now, what is it that makes the order of court worth anything more than the paper it is written on? Simply the power of the judge to call into court the person who disobeys it, and send him to jail until he does obey. What, then, is the surest way to encourage and protect such disobedience? To let the disobeyer demand an ordinary jury trial for investigating the simple question whether he is disobeying. A jury trial means, in the first place, long delay—a delay during which the offender calmly goes on doing or refusing to do just what the order forbade or commanded, and consummating—perhaps irreparably—the very harm which the order was designed to prevent; and, in the second place, a jury trial means often—and just in those cases where it can least be afforded—a total evasion of the order in the end, either by corrupting the jury or by appealing to the popular passions which may happen to sway them. In short, an order of court, shorn of the judge's power of immediate enforcement against those who disobey, is absolutely worthless, and leads by the shortest cut to nothing less than the wreck of courts and of civil justice. It is an apparently trifling difference; but, under our system, practically all hinges on this matter of who shall enforce the judge's order. Those who propose to defy the courts know this well, and that is just why they want the change. In the bold and unscrupulous language of its champion, Marion Butler, it will "strip the courts of their power." That is what they firmly believe it will do, and that is what it undoubtedly will do. Such a monstrous proposition is unthinkable, except as a first step to anarchy.

How has it come to be advanced? Mainly because the defenders of the Chicago riots want to make it sure that there will never again be any legal obstacle for those who wish to burn and destroy property; and, incidentally, because it is the federal courts that have chiefly stood in the way of such attempts. But in the effort to secure immunity for a limited class of wrong-doers, while veiling it under the ordinary generality of legal language, they have made the terms of the bill so broad that any and every wrong-doer would, by this change, find shelter for disobedience to any and every judicial command. To wreak vengeance on a particular class—the employers of labor—they wantonly strip the courts of the power to do justice to any part of the community.

But suppose the bill were properly drawn to attain its chief and particular end; suppose it provided merely that no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

federal judge should issue an injunction in any dispute between employers and employees, or in any dispute involving a strike; would the case be any better? We have had the wickedness of the injunction so dinned into our ears that we are apt to forget that it is not the injunction itself that is to be criticised, but the occasion of using it. There are occasions when honest and law-abiding persons may conceivably differ in opinion as to its propriety—as when Judge Jenkins orders certain railroad employees not to leave their work for the purpose of crippling commerce. It is at least an arguable question, both on principle and on precedent, whether a judge may order a man to go to work or to stay at work. But there are also occasions as to which honest and law-abiding persons ought not to differ—as when the federal court orders Debs and his men not to burn freight cars, or derail trains, or sandbag their fellow-workmen. Those are things which no decent citizen wants to do; and no one in his senses ought to wish to take away the power of a court to forbid him to do them. Even in the case where the propriety of the injunction is fairly arguable, there is no arbitrary order, no "tyranny," as the Populist fathers of this bill are fond of proclaiming. The person who is commanded or forbidden to act may appear in court and justify any claim he may have—whether to stay away from work, or to tear down a boundary fence, or to burn a freight-car. Debs could have had his day in court to oppose that injunction; he simply did not dare to come in, for there was nothing that he could say for himself. When Mr. Moseley, from the responsible office of Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, has the effrontery (as he had in his address last June to the Railroad Commissioners) to condole with Debs for being punished "without a trial," he falsely invokes the sympathy of a good sentiment to help a bad cause. The notion, industriously propagated, that an injunction necessarily lacks the fundamental fairness of hearing both sides, is a false one; and it is never advanced except by those who have a bad cause, and dare not defend it in court.

It is the mere resistance to law and order, after all is said, that is at the bottom of all such proposals as that of Senate Bill No. 2984. These men oppose the injunction, not because it is improperly granted, not because it does not give a fair hearing, not because it interferes with an honest man's livelihood, but because it is law and because they have to obey it. They do not want to obey it; they do not want to obey anything or anybody; they want to do as they please. It is the obedience to lawful force which irritates them. But this is just the lesson which the American people must learn thoroughly, at whatever cost, that the law is to be obeyed as such, and simply because it is law. If an injunction is, in your opinion, improperly issued, appear and show cause against it, but obey it in the meantime nevertheless; for without obedience, law and order vanish utterly, and every man's hand may be raised against his neighbor. Obey first and dispute afterwards, should be the motto of the self-respecting citizen. Defy and resist first, and obey in the end only if you have to, is the motto which the innovators propose to sanction on the statute-book. Any bill which is going to make such disobedience easier attacks liberty and property in every household in the land, and is nothing less than a bill to authorize anarchy.

A FINE TYPE OF JOURNALIST.

THE recent death of Horace Rublee, for many years editor of the Milwaukee *Sentinel* and the chief journalist of Wisconsin, merits national attention for two reasons. One is that his career was so honorable, and so serviceable to the best interests alike of his State and of the country, that it ought to receive recognition. The other is that the conditions of what is now often and properly called "the newspaper business," have so radically changed during his lifetime that he is an admirable example of what has seemed to be a passing type of journalist.

Mr. Rublee's story was of the kind which has always been so familiar in this country, and which still remains as familiar, despite Bryan's lament that the gold standard does not allow boys to "enter life with an even chance." Like Horace Greeley, Horace Rublee was the son of a poor New England farmer, having been born at Berkshire, Vt., in 1829. The family removed to Wisconsin in 1840, and the boy worked at home until he was twenty, meanwhile teaching country schools several terms. He then entered the State University, which was little better than our modern academy, and got the best that it had to give, helping to support himself by working at the case as a printer. Naturally enough, he drifted into reporting the proceedings of the Legislature, and from this was promoted to editorial work on the Madison *Journal*, then a Whig and soon afterwards a Republican organ. In a few years he had become chief editor and part proprietor. In 1869 he began a period of eight years' service as Minister to Switzerland, but he remained faithful to his early profession upon his return. For fifteen years past he had been editor of the Milwaukee *Sentinel*, the leading Republican newspaper and the most influential journal in Wisconsin.

Mr. Rublee had been reared to accept Greeley's conception of the place which an editor ought to occupy, as laid down in the latter's doctrine, that a journalist was "a public teacher," that "he necessarily had convictions, and was not likely to suppress them because they were not shared by others"; "in short, that his calling was other and higher than that of a waiter at a restaurant, expected to furnish whatever was called for, so long as the pay was forthcoming." Such a man had repeated opportunities to impress his convictions upon a State which entered the Union with less than 300,000 inhabitants shortly before he became old enough to vote, and had a population fully six times as great when he died. Before the war, some special local causes contributed to make the extreme State-rights sentiment stronger in Wisconsin than in the West generally, and Mr. Rublee's first great service was in crushing out that dogma and holding his State to the cause of the Union during the civil war. He was one of those old-school journalists who combined the chairmanship of his party's State committee and the work of an editor without loss of dignity, because he made use of this partisan position to impress right ideas upon the direction of the organization rather than to dispose of patronage and build up a "machine."

Upon his return from Switzerland, Mr. Rublee was importuned to resume the old place as chairman which he had filled with success and honor for ten years before going abroad. He consented, but only upon one condition. The Granger agitation a few years before had demoralized the politics of Wisconsin, and the growing strength of Greenbackism had rendered the managing politicians of the Republican party so timid that, in 1877, they shrank from adopting a straightforward sound-money platform. Mr. Rublee announced that he must withdraw from management of the canvass unless the campaign could be made upon lines far in advance of this "wabbling" platform. He proposed that a meeting should be held in Milwaukee, at which the candidates on the ticket and other leading Republicans should go on record as absolutely repudiating fiatism and positively favoring resumption in 1879, as then provided by law, and that resolutions of like tenor should be adopted. The suggestion was adopted. The chairman followed it up with an address to the voters which left no doubt whatever as to the attitude of the party in opposition to the movement for debasement of the currency, and the campaign was conducted to a successful issue, with little regard to the compromise platform. Nearly twenty years have passed since then, and Wisconsin has always remained a sound-money State.

It is such a career as this which makes a man, in the best sense of the words, "a great journalist." But this is not the modern type of that class. Run over the "great journals" of the country, and how many of them are controlled by men who have convictions which they are not ready to suppress if unpopular; how many by men who have no other and higher conception of their calling than that of a waiter at a restaurant, ready to furnish "serio-comic supplements" or "carni-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vals of crime," if the pay is forthcoming and promises to be greater than decency and dignity would command? In his just published 'Impressions and Experiences,' Mr. Howells has an interesting chapter on "The Country Printer," as he knew him in his father's newspaper office in the Western Reserve of Ohio forty years ago. "The greatest event of our year," he says, "was the publication of the President's message," and he tells how much more interested the people then were in the great issues of Government than in the "deadly and selfish cult of business" which he finds now. He goes on to say:

"Very likely people were less bent on the pursuit of wealth in those days, because there was less chance to grow rich, but the fact remains that they *were* less bent in that direction, and that they gave their minds to other things more than they do now. I think those other things were larger things, and that our civic type was once nobler than it is. It was before the period of corruption, when it was not yet fully known that dollars can do the work of votes, when the votes as yet rather outnumbered the dollars, and more of us had the one than the other. The great statesman, not the great millionaire, was then the American ideal, and all about in the villages and on the farms the people were eager to know what the President had said to Congress. They are not eager to know now, and that seems rather a pity."

There is much truth in all this, and the causes of the transformation afford an interesting field for study.

THE TSAR IN PARIS.

PARIS, October 20, 1896.

THE visit of the Emperor of Russia to Paris has a studied significance which cannot be denied. It is symbolic of the great change which has taken place in the galaxy of the European Powers. It is the affirmation of the evidence of a *Duplice* in opposition to the *Triplice*. Viewed in that light, it is a guarantee of the continuation of peace, of such a peace as that to which we have accustomed ourselves for twenty-five years, ruinous to the nations and incentive of national hatreds which become all the more inextinguishable as they are felt to be unsatisfied and impotent.

Those who witnessed the Russian fêtes in Paris (and the number is legion, as, from the statistics of the railroads, we can ascertain that there was added during those festive days a million of visitors to the population of Paris), all agree in saying that there was felt in the presence of the Emperor of Russia more than an idle curiosity—a deep and real enthusiasm. It was felt even more on the plains of Champagne, at Châlons, where 70,000 men were reviewed by the young sovereign, who made the military salute to every French flag. Good judges tell me that they never saw their soldiers, notwithstanding their fatigue, march with more alacrity or more decision; one of them told me that his men seemed to be marching to the assault.

The Emperor created, wherever he went, a very favorable impression. Full of reserve, speaking very little, he admired sufficiently, and did not admire too much. He might have said what the Doge of Venice did to Louis XIV., who took him over his palace at Versailles. "What astonishes you most here?" asked the King. "It is to see myself here." Even a touch of sadness, which never forsakes the young Emperor, and the melancholy of his smile, contrived to add something to the emotion of the multitude. People remembered the fearful tragedy of the coronation at Moscow; they called to mind the sudden death in a railway carriage of Prince Lobanoff, whom the young sovereign had chosen for his companion and his political guide during his journey through Europe. He seemed as if he was attended by the saddest thoughts. Many people, before his departure, tried to prevent him from going in person to Paris, reminding him of the attempt of Berezewski in the Champs-Élysées, and of the recent exploits of the Anarchists in Paris. Nicholas II. was determined to walk in the footsteps marked out for him by his father and to make his tour of Europe complete.

It was perhaps all the more necessary to give a sort of personal sanction, by his presence in the capital of the French republic, to the alliance between France and Russia, because it was doubted in many places, and in Berlin denied, that there existed a binding accord between the two countries similar to the Triple Alliance. Events follow each other so rapidly, the impressions which they leave are of such a character, that we have almost to make an effort of the imagination to go back to the days of the Dreikaiserbund, when the political constellation Germany, Austria, Russia, threw its apparently permanent light on all the political horizon. When all the diplomatic documents, now shut up in the archives, come to light, we shall know how the secession of Russia gradually took place. For a long time, the form of government in France, the instability of its Cabinet and even of its Executive power, seemed an insurmountable obstacle to any serious association of France and Russia. But certain forces were at work to counterbalance those which at first separated autocratic Russia from republican and demagogic France. These forces may be said to belong to the class of elementary forces which are always at work in humanity. It had been the task of Bismarck to keep together Prussia and Russia, notwithstanding the innate antagonism—one might even say hatred—which separates the Slavs from the Germans. The time came, however, when Russia perceived that she had given much and received little or nothing in return.

We have not quite forgotten the series of articles which an eminent writer, Klaczko, wrote on the relations of Russia and Prussia after the war of 1870. He collected them afterwards under the title of 'The Two Chancellors.' Prince Gortchakoff, the Russian Chancellor, had been outwitted by the German Chancellor, Bismarck, whom he had long considered as his pupil in diplomacy. The services rendered to Prussia during such a long period had been vain, and Klaczko summarized the conduct of Russia in the phrase "Love's labor lost." Disappointed love is apt to end in bitter hatred; the estrangement between the Empire of the North and the new German Empire began as early as 1875. "Make yourself strong" was a word several times used by the Russian Emperor in his conversations with the Ambassador of France. France did make herself strong again; she reorganized her army and emerged by degrees from her isolation. She tried her increasing strength in many directions, and adopted an active colonial policy. Germany encouraged this new form of her activity, in the hope of seeing her more and more absorbed in her colonial efforts.

Meanwhile Russia's sentiments towards her powerful neighbor suffered a complete change. The great efforts and sacrifices which she made in the Turkish war ended in the Treaty of Berlin; the independence of Bulgaria was but a poor consolation for Russia, which had carried her army, after Plevna, to the very gates of Constantinople. Bulgaria was, however, for some time a sort of dependency of Russia; her army was officered by Russian officers, and Sofia was no better than a Russian town. This situation changed when Prince Ferdinand of Coburg was chosen Prince of Bulgaria. When he saw Bismarck at the time and seemed to ask for his advice, Bismarck said to him, "You may go to Sofia; it will always be a pleasant souvenir." The German Chancellor appeared to treat very lightly the enterprise of the young Prince of Coburg, and it was said at St. Petersburg that Austria was his only patron. I have heard it said that the Emperor of Russia some time afterwards received communication of a dispatch from Prince Bismarck, in which the candidature of Prince Ferdinand was treated very seriously; Prince Ferdinand was to be the obstacle to Russian aggression in the valley of the Danube, the instrument of the traditional policy represented so long by Austria. The anger of Russia became all the more intense inasmuch as Prussia had affected a complete indifference to the Eastern Question. I believe it may be affirmed that it was from that time that the alliance with France took a tangible form, and that Russia framed for herself a definite policy. She withdrew from the Dreikaiserbund and prepared herself for an understanding with the French Republic.

The time came when it seemed necessary to quit the diplomatic shadow, and to act in full light. In July, 1891, a French squadron was sent to Cronstadt; the Tsar came on board the French vessels, and was received to the sound of the Marseillaise, which he heard with uncovered head. The officers of the French squadron had a solemn reception at St. Petersburg, and were invited to visit the Exposition at Moscow. In 1892, on the 6th of June, the Grand Duke Constantine went to Nancy to make a visit to M. Carnot, President of the Republic. In October, 1893, Amiral Avelan and his staff stayed for several days in Paris, and their presence was greeted by the French population. The Tsar Alexander III. wrote a letter to M. Carnot, thanking him for the "warm and splendid reception" which his sailors had met with on French soil. He added that these proofs of sympathy "would add a new tie to those which unite the two countries." In 1895, on the 10th of June, in answer to an interpellation made by the Left, M. Ribot, the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, said: "We have knit the interests of France with those of a great power. . . . The security which we derive from this *alliance* is and will remain a guarantee for the peace of the world."

It has been remarked that during the recent visit of the Emperor there was a sort of gradation in his utterances at Cherbourg, at the Élysée, at the Camp of Châlons. In the short answer made to the compliments of the French President, the Emperor was merely polite; at the President's table at the Élysée, replying to a toast of the French President, the Emperor said: "Faithful to traditions which cannot be forgotten, I have come to France to salute in your person the chief of a nation to which we are united by such precious bonds." Then, after the great review at Châlons, where the Emperor had seen 70,000 men march before

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him, he said: "France may be proud of its army. You are right in saying so, Mr. President, the two countries are bound by an unalterable friendship. There exists between our two armies a profound feeling of confraternity in arms." It is impossible not to be struck by the studied verbal gradation in these declarations.

It is very difficult to say what will be the consequences of manifestations which have apparently more of a sentimental than of a practical character. The Eastern question was in all probability discussed during the Russian Emperor's journey. It is impossible to suppose that the hearts of the young Emperor and his young wife, a granddaughter of Queen Victoria, should not have been moved by the horrors committed in Asia Minor and in Constantinople, on an unprecedented scale and with systematic ferocity. Thus far the action of diplomacy has been a mere mockery: the Sultan takes advantage of the jealousies and divisions of the great Powers. Time will show if at Vienna, at Breslau, at Balmoral, at Paris, some way has been found or even prepared for putting an end to atrocities which are a dishonor to our nineteenth century at its close.

There were not wanting some incidents in the Emperor's journey which must have spoken to his mind louder than the vulgar applause of the crowd. The Emperor added to the programme prepared for him a visit to the tomb of Napoleon. He was accompanied to the Invalides by a host of generals and aides-de-camp; but he left them all in the circular gallery which overhangs the place where the tomb stands in a crypt; he went down alone, stood for some time with his arms crossed on his breast, without a motion, gazing on the simple and solemn monument beneath which Napoleon sleeps his eternal sleep. What thoughts were his during these moments? "Sic transit gloria mundi." I have been told of another incident, which remains in my mind. When the Emperor and Empress were taken over the palace of Versailles by the very intelligent conservateur, who does all in his power to keep intact this admirable monument of French art and French greatness, they admired the splendor of the *grands appartemens* and the *petits appartemens;* they lingered a moment in the rooms which were inhabited by Marie Antoinette. In a narrow corridor the conservateur remarked to their Majesties, "It was by this corridor that Marie Antoinette escaped when the palace was attacked by the mob on the night of October 5." The Emperor and Empress looked gravely at each other without saying a word. Such incidents make one think of the "Et nunc erudimini" of Bossuet, or of the famous "Dieu seul est grand, mes frères," of the preacher who began with these words the funeral oration of Louis le Grand.

Correspondence.

ENGLISH AT COLLEGE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In most of the large endowed academies and high schools a large percentage of each graduating class is made up of those who have been little more than one year in the school from which they have gone directly to college. These boys are able to offer themselves for admission to college with adequate attainments in mathematics, Latin, Greek, French, or German. But early habits have made their clumsy use of the English language almost incurable. The school hasn't the heart to tell them they ought not to enter college on account of their English, and it would seem as if the college had not the courage to do so. These boys, very many of them, have had very limited early opportunities for hearing or reading good English; somewhere about fifteen to seventeen years of age, they have been awakened to the importance of an education and have become ambitious for a liberal education. The first fifteen or more years of their lives have been as good as wasted, so far as culture is concerned, and it would be scarcely less difficult to work immediate and rapid improvement in their English than to teach them to carry themselves with the dignity and grace of the courtier.

Again, there are those who have been the victims of extraordinary and timorous parental supervision—who have not been allowed to go to school for fear of contamination from other children. Perhaps they have spent much time abroad, where, of course, they could not learn English. Perhaps they have been under French or German nurses in childhood, and governesses in later years, from whom they learned French or German, and geography, and mathematics, but from whom, of course, they did not learn English—they were not expected to learn it. The more able their parents were to maintain an expensive home and social life, the more have they been left to the society of servants whose English has not been considered one of the qualifications for their work; and at ten or twelve years of age they have been sent to school illiterate so far as the knowledge of their mother tongue is concerned.

Finally, the English heard and used by children when among themselves and away from the class-room will undo in one day the instruction of many days.

The work of the Harvard committee, therefore, should be to discover, as the schoolmasters claim, what the schools have been *trying* to do, and *how* they have been trying to do it, and *why* the results, in so many cases, have been so discouraging. I believe that a thorough search along these lines will show that the schoolmasters are right in insisting on an examination into their methods and the limited conditions under which they have been compelled to work, rather than the unintelligible and unwarranted exhibition of results that could not, under the circumstances, have been otherwise. The work of teaching children to use accurately, in their examinations, such English as the Harvard committee think they have a right to require and expect of candidates, is often as impossible of achievement as would be the effort to make a silk purse out of a pig's ear. Edward G. Coy.

Lakeville, Conn.

Notes.

A. C. Armstrong & Son will be the American publishers of 'Meissonier: His Life and his Art,' by Vallery C. O. Gréard of the French Academy, with profuse illustrations, full-page and in the text, the former being partly in photogravure and partly in color.

'Driving for Pleasure; or, the Harness Stable and its Appointments,' by Francis T. Underhill, with elaborate illustrations, and 'Master Ardick, Buccaneer,' by F. J. Costello, are in the press of D. Appleton & Co.

George H. Richmond & Co. issue immediately 'The Triumph of Death,' by Gabriele D'Annunzio, with an etched portrait of this Italian novelist.

Henri Rochefort's 'Adventures of My Life,' Englished by E. W. Smith, and filling two octavo volumes, will be published by Edward Arnold.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. have nearly ready 'The Mycenæan Age,' by Dr. Chrestos Tsountas and Prof. Manatt of Brown University, with a preface by Dr. Dörpfeld; a Cambridge Edition of Lowell's Complete Poetical Works; and a holiday edition of Thoreau's 'Cape Cod,' with a hundred illustrations in color by Miss Amelia M. Watson.

Ginn & Co. are on the point of bringing out 'Napoléon: Extraits de Mémoires et d'Histoires,' edited by Prof. Alcée Fortier of the University of Louisiana.

Henry T. Coates & Co., Philadelphia, announce for immediate publication 'Fireside Stories, Old and New,' collected by Henry T. Coates.

Way & Williams will publish shortly 'The Real Issue,' Kansas stories by William Allen White.

William Doxey, San Francisco, has in forward preparation 'Tales of Languedoc,' folklore stories, by Samuel Jacques Brun of Leland Stanford Junior University, with an introduction by Harriet W. Preston and forty illustrations by Ernest Peixotto; and 'The Itinerant House, and Other Stories,' by Emma Frances Dawson.

Bernard C. Steiner of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, has ready for the press and invites subscription to 'A History of the Plantation of Menunkatuck and of the Original Town of Guilford [the present towns of Guilford and Madison, Conn.], 1636-1896.' The price to subscribers is $2.50, and assurance of a return for the outlay of manufacture is a requisite preliminary to publication. The papers of the late Ralph Dunning Smith have been supplemented by much research on Mr. Steiner's part in the town records and elsewhere.

Mr. Charles Welsh, who, it will be remembered, exploded the long-accepted story about the sale and purchase of the MS. of 'The Vicar of Wakefield' by his researches into the account-books of the celebrated publisher of St. Paul's Churchyard, to whose business he succeeded, has been for some months in New York associated with the *Art Amateur*. Mr. Welsh has made children's literature, both of the past and the present, his especial study, as his two opuscula on the subject presented by him to The Sette of Odd Volumes in London testify. He is at present engaged upon the revision and extension of his articles on "The History of Books for Children," which appeared in the *Newbery House Magazine*, with a view to their republication in volume form, and perhaps as an intimation that he may one day be again issuing books with his own imprint.

We resume our account of the reprints so numerously put forth this season with the concluding volumes (iii. and iv.) of Shelton's version of 'Don Quixote' (London: David Nutt). This work, we remind our readers, belongs in the admirable series of "Tudor Translations." It follows closely the original text—perhaps too closely in the eccentric punctuation, though this has its archaic effect, as has what Moxon would have called the capitalling. The volumes, we repeat, are in the first rank of book-making, and the binding is both rich and solid. The set makes a charming possession.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

T. Y. Crowell & Co. add to the new editions noticed last week Cooper's "Leather Stocking Tales," with an introduction by Prof. Brander Matthews, and twenty respectable illustrations by Frank T. Merrill. The external appearance of these five volumes is attractive and the typography clear. Presswork and paper fall off a little, with a view to a popular price. The same publishers reissue Mrs. Carey's abridged translation of Victor Duruy's 'History of France,' in two volumes, with a few extra pages by Prof. Jameson, bringing the narrative up to date; likewise Browning's 'Saul,' with unequal but sometimes exceptionally good illustrations by Frank O. Small; and Lucy Crane's translation of Grimm's 'Household Stories,' prettily illustrated by Walter Crane. Quite new are renderings, by Helen B. Dole, of Pierre Loti's 'Iceland Fisherman' and André Theuriet's 'Rustic Life in France.' Both these books, the latter especially, are more elegant than the foregoing, and Léon Lhermitte's designs usefully accompany Theuriet's agreeable text. The translation is noticeably idiomatic and cultivated.

Much taste and good workmanship has gone into the making of Messrs. Lippincott's new edition of Ouida's 'Under Two Flags,' in two volumes with ornamented blue-cloth binding and a handsome page on fine paper. The best of G. Montrard's designs are spirited in action or sympathetic with nature. This latest dress will commend itself to admirers of the story and of Ouida.

A high level is also reached in Charles Scribner's Sons' reproduction of Thomas Nelson Page's 'In Ole Virginia,' to illustrate which no fewer than six of our leading designers have been called in. A very unusual evenness results from this coöperation, which is made interesting by the fact of a Frenchman, A. Castaigne, having his full quota. The eye of a native can see at a glance the deflection from nature which this artist must needs betray. Messrs. Smedley, Clinedinst, Reinhart, Frost, and Pyle offer each something to admire, but among Mr. Clinedinst's five we incline to seek the pick of the two dozen full-page plates.

Lovers of music will welcome the appearance of a new edition of a book by Dr. Hubert H. Parry, of the first edition of which we said that, were we asked to name a single book that every student of music ought to read and reread for its facts and opinions, we should unhesitatingly select the 'Art of Music.' We also referred to the title of the book as "modest and somewhat indefinite." To remove this indefiniteness the author has changed the title to 'The Evolution of the Art of Music,' which much better indicates the scope of the book. The new edition forms a volume of the International Scientific Series (Appletons), and, while the type is smaller, the price has, by way of compensation, been reduced more than one-half.

The eighteenth and closing volume of the beautiful illustrated edition of the works of Mrs. Juliana Horatia Ewing, published by the S. P. C. K. (E. & J. B. Young & Co.), contains a memoir by her sister, Mrs. Eden, and a selection from her letters. Her great industry as a writer is shown by an interesting bibliographical list of her stories and magazine articles; the first of a series of 122 appearing in 1861, the last after her death in 1885.

'A History of Rome to the Death of Cæsar,' by W. W. How, M.A., and H. D. Leigh, M.A., Fellows and Lecturers of Oxford (Longmans, Green & Co.), is thick and heavy, though not very large. It cannot be read. The affected style is an attempted cross between the euphuism of 1596 and the journalism of 1896. To be sure, our authors tell us the book was not meant to be read, it was meant to be crammed. They veil the intent in the phrase "to meet the requirements of the upper forms at schools and of the pass examinations at the universities." On constitutional and antiquarian questions they have bowed to Mommsen's "paramount authority, and even from his somewhat sweeping judgment of parties and persons they have never dissented without hesitation."

A new and well-printed edition of Dante's 'Vita Nova,' by Friedrich Beck, has just been published by Piloty & Loehle in Munich. The text is the result of the collation of thirty-five manuscripts, the variants being printed in the foot-notes. There is an introductory criticism of all existing manuscripts, followed by a complete list of previous editions of the original text.

Two volumes of literary criticism, the contents of which have for the most part appeared in the Paris daily press, come from the house of Armand Colin: the second series of Adolphe Brisson's "Portraits Intimes" and the third series of Gaston Deschamps's "La Vie et les Livres." Of nearly equal bulk, they are of different grades of merit. Brisson is very sketchy, and attaches himself more to the personality of the writer than to the character and value of his work. Some of the more notable of the articles are those on Heredia, Brunetière, Mounet-Sully, Bodinier, and Coppée. Deschamps gives a better return for the time and attention bestowed on his book. He is more purposeful and serious; he both thinks himself and provokes thought. He writes agreeably, in a smooth and flowing style; his education, his reading, and his travels have combined to make him very pleasant, well-informed company. He gives a fair study of Heredia, a better of Verlaine; hits Bourget prettily, and gathers a comically erroneous idea of America from that author's 'Outre-mer.' He has a good chapter on Gaston Paris, and that on 'La Littérature et la Démocratie' is still more to be praised.

With the October issue, Mr. George W. Cable's little circular, the *Letter*, becomes the *Symposium*, adding one more to the host of magazines called into being and competition by the magic wand of "process." The illustrations and the spirit that breathes in this periodical are refined, and will secure entrance into many homes for the editor's well-known humanitarian propaganda. The publication office is at No. 41 Centre Street, Northampton, Mass.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of American History* prints for the first time, from a manuscript in the possession of the Pennsylvania Historial Society, Penn's draft of "Fundamentall Constitutions" for the future State, intended to be subscribed by the first purchasers, but probably never submitted to them, though there is evidence some were shown it. It is in all respects a very interesting precursor of the Frame of Government. One provision and one official designation, viz., that of Commissioners of Education, has a very modern sound. These officers formed one of four committees into which the Governor was to divide the Council, and they were to "inspect the breeding of Youth, as to Schools, Masters, Books and the way and Method of Cultivateing and improveing of science truely so called." It is well known that education in Pennsylvania did not respond to this early and high concern for it.

The September number of *Petermann's Mitteilungen* contains a chart, with explanatory text by Prof. Sievers, of the distribution of vegetation in Venezuela. It is so ingeniously colored as to show the position and extent of the different tracts devoted to the cultivation of sugar, coffee, cocoa, and cereals, as well as of the forests and savannas. On a second map are traced the routes of the most noted travellers, from Humboldt to the present day, and it is surprising to see how little of the country has been explored. Dr. Sven Hedin describes, with the aid of a series of charts, the various changes noted since 1720 of the bed of Lake Lob-nor and its tributary streams, owing to the action of the wind and sand. There is further an account of the new boundary treaties between Chili and Bolivia and the Argentine Republic, and a strong appeal for an Antarctic expedition to be headed by Dr. Nansen.

The interest in Russia for geographical research seems to be on the increase. During the year 1895 the Geographical Society published a history of its work for the previous fifty years in three volumes, to which a new map of Russia in Asia (130 miles to the inch) is appended. There were also ten other publications — travels, memoirs, bibliography, an ethnographic periodical, etc. Eight other works, mostly on Asia, are being printed; and still a number of others, including two more volumes of 'Addenda to Ritter's Asia,' are in preparation.

In Russia one observes, too, a rapid development of practical instruction in agriculture in connection with the village schools. In the province of Ekaterinoslav, for instance, according to the biennial report, a résumé of which is given in *Nature*, "nearly one-half of the schools in the province (227 out of 504) are already in possession of small model kitchen-gardens, orchards, tree-plantations, or farms, at which gardening, sylviculture, and sericulture are regularly taught." These farms and gardens have an area of 283 acres, and contained last year 111,000 fruit trees and 238,300 planted forest trees, the province being mostly treeless. There are also a thousand beehives, kept partly by the teachers and partly by the children. In central Russia the culture of cereals principally is taught, while in Caucasia especial attention is given to instruction in the culture of the silkworm and the vine.

A rescript issued by the Prussian Minister of Instruction, and published in the September number of the *Zentralblatt für die gesammte Unterrichtsverwaltung in Preussen*, permits women to attend the lectures in all departments of Prussian universities, provided they have pursued the necessary preparatory studies and obtain the consent of the professors or tutors directly concerned. Heretofore, in accordance with the rescript of August 9, 1886, each special case of this kind had to be referred to the Minister of Instruction for his decision; but this inconvenient and practically almost prohibitory restriction is now abolished.

According to an order just issued by the Government of the Grand Duchy of Baden, physicians wishing to pass the so-called *Physikatsprüfung*, an examination enabling them to hold a medical position in the service of the State, must (1) have attended lectures on psychiatry and medical jurisprudence in a German university; (2) have had three months' clinical instruction and experience in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the treatment of the insane; (3) have pursued a course of study in bacteriology; (4) have practised medicine at least two years in the Grand Duchy of Baden. These conditions do not differ essentially from those already imposed by Prussia and Saxony, which are, however, more liberal in not confining the two years' obligatory practice of medicine to any one German State, but extending it to the whole empire; less advanced than Baden in not requiring either clinical experience as an alienist or special knowledge of bacteriology.

Additional folios of the Geological Atlas of the United States continue to be issued for various parts of the country by our National Geological Survey. A list of folios completed and in preparation may be had on addressing the Director of the Survey, Washington, D. C. The price, generally twenty-five cents a folio, is extremely moderate for work of so high a grade, including explanatory text, topographic, geologic, and economic map, and structural sections. The greatest number of sheets within a single district are in Tennessee and Alabama, where a considerable area is now covered. Other sheets are from widely separated localities. The lithographic work is executed with great skill, the register being practically perfect. The Three-Forks (Montana) folio may be mentioned as exhibiting a particularly harmonious combination of colors in a very intricate pattern, with an effect much more pleasing than that produced by hand-colored maps of the British Survey.

The waterspout on Vineyard Sound, August 19 last, observed by thousands of summer residents for many miles along the shore of Martha's Vineyard and Cape Cod, was well photographed by J. N. Chamberlain, Cottage City, Mass., who sells prints of various sizes at prices ranging from twenty-five to fifty cents. The larger view gives a most impressive picture of the cylindrical spout, majestically suspended from the clouds at the height of a mile, as estimated by Prof. Dwight of Vassar College, its whirling column reaching vertically down to the foaming waters of the Sound. This is by far the best photograph of a spout that has come to our notice. The heavy rain that fell on the island soon after the spout broke up, was found at several points to be salt; and this is naturally ascribed to the ascent of sea water in the spout.

The recent adverse decision of the Court of Appeal at Rouen in the now famous case of scientific plagiarism, Cremieux-Jamin vs. Lombroso, reinforces a good idea that comes from Prof. Michael Foster, secretary of the Royal Society. Prof. Foster suggests an international organization of scientific men for the purpose of registering at frequent intervals the results of contemporary investigation. Such a body would serve not only to protect the investigator from prosecution, but also to prevent him from going over ground already trodden. For the world of science at large, it could perform a valuable service by discriminating what has become common property from what is still in the possession of the original author.

The freshman class of the Johns Hopkins Medical School for the collegiate year 1896-97 shows better than any of the three earlier ones the non-local character of its students, as well as the promptness with which higher standards of admission to professional schools are responded to. The first freshman class under the requirement of a B.A. degree for admission numbered nineteen (three women), and represented ten States and eleven colleges. This year the forty-three freshmen (fourteen women) represent sixteen States and twenty-three colleges, of which seven are co-educational. Yale contributes the largest contingent of men (five) and Smith of women (four). Eight of the men and four of the women—(three of these B.A. Leland Stanford University)—have taken their bachelor's degrees at some co-educational institution. In addition to Smith, the other women's colleges sending graduates are Wellesley three, and Barnard, Radcliffe, and Vassar each one. Not the least interesting fact brought out by the list is the greater proportional increase of women in this year's class.

—Dr. Murray, in his new section of the Oxford English Dictionary (Macmillan), is still in the doldrums of the prefix dis-, casting anchor at *disobservant*. There is a light breeze at *dish* and *disk*, which are both derived, like desk and dais, from the Latin *discus*. "To dish," in the sense of 'to do for,' is first cited from 1798; "dishing the Whigs" was already proverbial in 1869. Phonetic reformers are confronted with the perverse preference shown for the spelling *disc* over *disk* in some branches of science, botany not included. They will hardly accept the plea that the distinction is convenient (for the eye), but the survival of the fittest will have its way. *Dismiss*, we are shown, has beaten out of sight not only its antecedent *dismit*, but "the etymologically more regular forms *dimit*, *dimiss*, and *demit*." In another camp, that of the purists in -our, some alarm should be spread on finding *discolor*, *discoloration* given precedence over *discolour*, *discolouration*, though *dishonour*, etc., still keep to the front. A dead uniformity, again, is forbidden, if only by the exigencies of poetry, in the accentuation of *discrepance*, *-ancy*, and *-ant*. The first form has obviously no rhyming utility (except comic) unless the antepenult be stressed, and this stress is marked dominant by Dr. Murray; *discrepancy* has greater utility for male than for female rhyming and tends in fact to be stressed on the antepenult (in this case the root); *discrepant* follows the one substantive for rhyme, the other for metre. Prose usage selects as it pleases. The United States has merely cherished, not invented, *disgruntle*, the citations ranging from 1682 in the mother country to 1884 in Dakota and the Lisbon *Star;* Mr. Bryce calls it "an expressive American term," but there is nothing piggish about us. "To disguise" with liquor remounts to 1562; the indispensable *disgust* and its derivatives are post-Shaksperian. To Horace Walpole in 1754 we owe *disjecta membra* in a loose borrowing from his Latin namesake. We reserve to the last Dr. Murray's trump card, the etymology of *dismal*, now first worked out: "Old French *dis mal*=Latin *dies mali*, evil days, unlucky days," also known as *dies Ægyptiaci*, "Egipcian daies." The proof of this is quite incontrovertible.

— Mr. Henry Bradley's section (Fish-Flexuose) chances to be somewhat richer in interesting vocables and etymologies, *e. g.*, *flask*, *flag*, *flake*, *fit*, *fix*, etc. American solely is the usage "to fit for college"; and "to fix up," "to fix it," and "fix a jury" originated on this side of the water, along with *fixings* and the more or less synonymous *fixtures*. *Flapjack* is ours only by survival, as it occurs in English literature in 1600 and still lingers in dialect. Something of our due is denied us when *flagpole* passes unrecorded; and might not one of our New England novels supply *flat*, abbreviated from *flat-iron?* "To flat out" is credited to us as indigenous metaphor, and so is "to fizzle," 'to fail.' The transitive verb "to flam," 'to deceive by a sham story or trick, or by flattery,' is set down as obsolete except in dialect or in the United States, the sole quotation for the latter being from 'Sam Slick.' Whether Judge Haliburton in this instance was truly reporting us or not, the word has now no meaning or currency, we believe, here any more than in written English. *Five twenty* (*viz.*, the Government bond so-called) is allowed a full rubric as a well-established Americanism. We must go back to England and the year 1772 for *flabbergast*. Marryat, in 'Peter Simple' (1833), appears to have invented *flapdoodle*, and to have furnished the definition—"the stuff they feed fools on," while *fishy*, in the sense of 'questionable,' shady,' etc., is traced to Disraeli's 'Coningsby' (1844); two instances of the part that fiction may play in extending the popular vocabulary. Many a poet might envy the making such an addition to our counters of speech as Dr. Samuel Clarke's "the eternal fitness of things" (1705). We conclude with a brief extract touching *flee* and *fly*. The confusion between these verbs, says Mr. Bradley, is met with in Old English:

> "In modern English the association of the two verbs has the curious result that the ordinary prose equivalent of Latin *fugere* is *fly*, with past tense and past participle *fled* (the forms *flew*, *flown* have only the sense of Latin *volare*), while *flee* has become archaic, being confined to more or less rhetorical or poetic diction. Even *fly* and *fled*, indeed, now belong rather to literary than to colloquial English; expressions like 'run away' being substituted in familiar speech."

—The volumes of Mr. Traill's 'Social England' (New York: Putnams; London: Cassell) continue to make their appearance with commendable rapidity. The fifth is now before us, covering the period from the accession of George I. to the battle of Waterloo, and it is an evident improvement upon its predecessors. There is less incompetent work in it, and more than one of the really qualified writers who have contributed to previous volumes have now reached a period in which they are at home. Some names of weight disappear from the list of contributors, but in recompense there are acceptable additions to the staff. Mr. Sandys of Cambridge, for instance, furnishes us with an instructive little sketch, covering twenty pages, of the history of English scholarship between 1570 and 1742. We welcomed Mr. Saintsbury's arrival in the third volume to take charge of Elizabethan literature; it is, we must confess, with a sigh of relief that we find him giving place in 1784 to Mr. Traill himself. Mr. Saintsbury has much knowledge, some insight, and a good deal of individuality—blessed quality in a book written to order! Some of his happy phrases cling to the memory, like his characterization of Pope as a "performer on the couplet," and his description of the eighteenth century as one of "plain thinking and high living." But it is possible to get a little tired of his scintillations, his affectations, his slipshod ease; and Mr. Traill's more correct and dignified style consorts well with a juster and soberer judgment. When we come to the sections on religion we miss Mr. Hutton's amenity and charity. The writer who takes his place, and discourses on "The Established Church, 1715-1815," repeats with unguarded emphasis the conventional lamentations over Latitudinarianism. He fails to perceive either that the Deistic and Subscription controversies had a natural place in the history of Eng-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish thought, or that England owes to the illogical compromises of eighteenth-century discussion its escape from the sharp antagonisms of Catholic and atheist, absolutist and revolutionist, which are the curses of Continental life. He might have learned this even from Mr. Leslie Stephen's unsympathetic pages; but we notice that both the 'History of English Thought' and Mark Pattison's well-known essay are conspicuous by their absence from the list of authorities for church history (p. 513).

—Mr. Traill has thought to avoid the charge of partiality by intrusting the history of "Nonconformity, 1689-1815," to Dr. John Brown, the author of the 'Life of John Bunyan'; bnt we fear he has saved his own reputation only at the expense of the book. Like his conformist colleague, but in different phraseology, Dr. Brown laments the "decline in spiritual life," "the wave of lifeless Arian teaching," and so on. That the movement of thought by which Presbyterian Calvinism changed itself into Unitarianism had close parallels in Scotland, in Geneva, and in New England, and is hardly explained with adequacy as "slumber and decay," has apparently never occurred to him. That the Evangelical movement had its reverse side is never hinted at; and the whole account from every point of view is meagre to an unfortunate degree. Twenty-two lines on George Whitefield are surely inadequate in a work on this scale: they are fewer than another writer is allowed to devote to the cut of men's coats between 1786 and 1800 (p. 495). In contrast to the skimped ecclesiastical sections are those concerning the military forces. Major Gretton takes sufficient elbow-room, but we do not grudge it to him; for this is, so far as we know, the first popular general history which has attempted to tell us something of the internal life of the army, and it is told entertainingly. So also Dr. Hughes's sections on the history of art are leisurely and complete—among the best in the book. While cutting the pages, we have noticed, more or less at haphazard, two or three questionable statements which may be recorded here, in the interests of a second edition. What evidence is there of any indebtedness on the part of Adam Smith either to Massie or to Anderson (p. 335), except to the latter, perhaps, for a few historical details? Is not "senseless" an over-strong epithet to apply to the laws of parochial settlement (p. 337), seeing how naturally they were begotten by the principle of parochial responsibility? And, finally, can Burke be fairly said ever to have held "democratic views" (p. 488)?

—It is exactly twelve years ago (Thursday, November 6, 1884) that the *Nation* drew the attention of its readers to the appearance of the advance sheets of an important Oriental work, 'Avesta, the Sacred Books of the Parsis,' being the preliminary announcement of a new edition of the Zoroastrian scriptures, in preparation by Prof. Karl F. Geldner, then of Tübingen, Germany, now of the University of Berlin. Since that time the publication of the great work has been steadily pushed forward, and the completed edition now lies before us, a monument of the learned editor's sound scholarship, good judgment, and untiring toil. The royal octavo pages, with clear print on heavy paper, and with initial rubric letters, make up three stately volumes, a bible from which the Parsis in their temples may read with pride, or expound the remains of holy writ of their prophet Zoroaster, who lived at least six centuries before the Christian era. The division *Yasna* of the texts is a sort of prayer-book; the *Gathas* are the Psalms, or metrical sayings of the Prophet; the *Yashts* are heroic tales or hymns of praise; the *Vendidad* is an Iranian Pentateuch. The edition is published in two forms, one with German and one with English foot-notes and introduction. The Prolegomena is of itself an important contribution, for it sheds a flood of light upon many obscure problems as to the relation between the various manuscripts which we have of the 'Avesta,' and it also makes clear the general plan and method which Dr. Geldner has adopted in his editorial task. Those who have watched with interest the progress of this monumental edition will be glad to know that a knightly order was bestowed by the King of Würtemberg upon the editor in recognition of the importance of his contribution to the science of philology; and special favors were conferred upon the publisher, the house of Kohlhammer, in Stuttgart, for the service he had rendered to the cause of Oriental learning.

LOTHROP'S SEWARD.

William Henry Seward. By Thornton Kirkland Lothrop. [American Statesmen Series.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1896.

THERE have been but few longer and more eventful careers in our history than that of William H. Seward. He took up his political pen in 1824 to denounce the "Albany Regency," and one might almost say that he held it in his hand until he left the Department of State in March, 1869. At different times during these forty-five years he was a leader in three distinct parties. At first he worked secretly with the Anti-Masons; then he wrote their campaign addresses, and drafted the resolutions which became the platform of the first national convention. Before 1850, of course, Clay and Webster were greater and more imposing Whigs than the New Yorker; but, from the beginning of the struggle growing out of the Mexican war, Seward stood at the head of the movement designed to fight the Slave Power with weapons political. His speeches outranked all others, and are to-day the most profitable for reading by the student of politics. He gave a happy name to that "irrepressible conflict" which the abolitionists announced when they directed their attack on the pro-slavery Constitution. From 1861 to 1869 he shaped the foreign policy of the country. He gradually came to have so little sympathy with his old allies that by 1866 he had ceased to be a Republican.

The new volume in the American Statesmen Series is more satisfactory as a general sketch of the history of which Seward was a part than as a study of the life of a great statesman and politician. The author's style is lucid, and he shows much ability in defining the old issues with brevity and force. Those who have read the sketch of Seward which Mr. George E. Baker prepared in vain for the campaign of 1860, and who are familiar with the three volumes of memoirs and letters which Mr. Frederick W. Seward published a few years ago, will be surprised to see how little has been added as to either facts or interpretation, and how much has been omitted. Seward's theory was that "the faults of great men drop out in history," and he and his three biographers have aimed to illustrate this theory. Baker's volume was written under Seward's eye, and the work by Mr. F. W. Seward is largely made up of his own recollections and of the letters which his father wrote to Mrs. Seward. Seward was a devoted husband, and his letters to his wife, whose health compelled her to remain in Auburn much of the time, have much value. They were designed to soothe an invalid whose political ideas were much more in harmony with those of Sumner and of John P. Hale than with those of Seward and Weed, yet parts of these letters are quoted as if they were as authoritative and significant as was the confidential correspondence between Seward and Weed.

Seward was so much greater than his faults or mistakes that it is a grave error, for one who pretends to be an independent biographer, to fail to make entirely independent researches and to draw conclusions accordingly. Mr. Lothrop has been so disturbed by the criticisms of Seward's acts at different times by such scholars as Von Holst, Rhodes, Nicolay and Hay, and others, that his chief concern is to defend rather than to describe his hero. The result is that he gives us very little insight into Seward's character and the sources of his political power; he deprives Seward's career of much of its scope and vivacity. The ambitious, calculating, adroit politician, with a strong flavor of philanthropic zeal, who wrote party addresses, influenced senatorial committees, guided party caucuses, and trimmed his sails to the varying winds, is not to be found in this narrative. But impartial historians and unbiassed contemporaries of Seward so paint him. How, again, he managed to obtain his leadership and to keep an enthusiastic following, we are not distinctly told. Mr. Lothrop lacks neither ability nor candor, but he has made so poor use, or none at all, of such sources of information as the Albany *Evening Journal*, the *Times* and the *Tribune* of New York, the public documents, the *Congressional Globe*, and the unpublished diplomatic dispatches, that he sees only one side of Seward.

The three questions which attracted most attention during Seward's Governorship were his ideas on internal improvements, his recommendations in regard to the school question, and his contest with the Governor of Virginia and the New York Legislature because he would not surrender persons alleged to have violated Virginia's slave code. The present biographer has given a good summary of the discussion about the last question, but the treatment of the other two points is entirely inadequate. If he had explained how Seward came to say in his annual message of 1840, "I do not hesitate, therefore, to recommend the establishment of schools in which they [children of foreigners] may be instructed by teachers speaking the same language with themselves and professing the same faith," and if he had told us how Seward undertook to deny what this language plainly meant, he would have prepared us for Seward's emasculation of his "irrepressible conflict" when the Presidency was in sight. If he had found time to outline Seward's theories and arguments in regard to internal improvements, and to show how Seward favored the payment of State indebtedness by having the surplus revenue of the United States distributed among the several States, and by obtaining from the national Government a large sum for the use of public highways, he would have been describing an ardent paternalist, and would have disclosed one of the springs of Seward's popularity at a time when notions of finance and taxation almost as strange as those of to-day were current.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Lothrop does not mean to misrepresent or conceal the facts. It is evident that his omissions, his general terms, his failure to notice striking situations and to see and describe the sequence of events, are due to his unfamiliarity with New York politics of the time. Everybody knows, in a vague way, that Seward owed as much to Weed's devotion as he did to his own efforts. We are informed that an accident in Rochester led to "Seward's first meeting with the man whose friendship and influence played so important a part in his whole political career" (page 9). What was the wonderful relation between the two men, and how did Weed manage campaigns and legislatures in Seward's interest? Surely these are not side issues. Weed's autobiography, Seward's letters, and the newspapers of the period supply the whole story, but the present biographer leaves it to our imagination. The range of Seward's abilities was best manifested by the influence he exerted upon President Taylor, and by the arguments with which he confronted Webster, Clay, and the whole South. How did it happen that Taylor accepted such a radical as Seward for his most intimate adviser and public defender in the Senate? Taylor owed the Presidency largely to the manipulations of Thurlow Weed; the community of interests between Seward and Weed brought Seward into Taylor's confidence several days before the inauguration, in 1849. Seward was, what Mr. Lothrop does not show, a shrewd politician as well as a statesman with high moral purposes.

The outlines of the struggle over the great compromise of 1850 are excellent. It is commonly regarded as fortunate that the issue between the sections was not brought to a head in 1850, but Mr. Lothrop maintains the contrary. If he is right, then Seward must be classed as the master statesman of that day. It seems altogether probable that, if Taylor had lived, the fact that he was a Southerner and determined to make a forcible opposition to secession, would have made it impossible to unite the South in favor of disunion.

The wildest of recent Jingoes were tame indeed in comparison with Seward when he discussed the duties of our Government towards Hungary and the Powers that united to prevent her from securing her independence. Mr. Lothrop clearly sees the meaning of Seward's plea, and frankly says: "It advocated a meddlesome foreign policy, inconsistent with the position, the interests, and the prosperity of the United States. . . . The sober sense of Congress saved us from the possible consequences of Seward's rash and Quixotic proposal" (p. 118). This is none too severe, and Mr. Lothrop deserves much credit for having discarded his bias and cut loose from his predecessors. Seward's speech of March 9, 1852, shows that he early had a passion for a dashing foreign policy. A description of his attitude as Senator on several other foreign questions would have furnished an interesting introduction to the great Secretary of State of later years. In foreign affairs, Seward gave his imagination full sway where it would not favor the Southern policy of conquest and expansion. The necessity he was under, as an anti-slavery man, to oppose this policy, led him to make two or three very wise and sober arguments, exactly contrary, in purpose and meaning, to those for Hungary and "Irish Patriots."

Eight pages are given to an attempt to discredit Montgomery Blair's story that Seward told him that he (Seward) had suggested to Senator Dixon of Kentucky the idea of amending Douglas's first Nebraska bill so as to make the repeal of the Missouri Compromise entirely clear. It is a matter of very slight importance whether Seward made this suggestion or not. Prior to 1854, there was no chance of Whig success except by maintaining an alliance between the Northern and Southern wings of the party. During the last three Presidential campaigns, the Whigs in each section allowed their allies in the other section to follow the policy which seemed most likely to attract voters. Their leaders consulted together then just as ours do to-day. The Southern Whigs had lost popularity because the Democrats had shown themselves to be more strongly pro-slavery. At the end of 1853, no one supposed that the Missouri Compromise had been repealed or was likely to be; but men talked of it because it interested Buncombe. If Seward had thought that it would strengthen the Southern Whigs to be more explicit than the Democrats about the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, it would have been perfectly natural and consistent with his methods to make the alleged suggestion. In fact, if he had wished to help the Southern Whigs and at the same time benefit the cause of anti-slavery, the political situation indicated that he could best do so by causing the reference to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise to be made more distinct. This would and did make its passage more difficult, because it set the issue clearly before Northerners; while Southerners were sure to favor as little or as much as they could obtain for slavery. The outcome was a great surprise. Some have inferred from what Blair says that Seward professed to be aiming to form a sectional party. Even the language of Blair, who was a bitter enemy of Seward, does not warrant this; and the reluctance with which Seward gave up the Whig party clearly shows that he had no desire to wreck it.

Seward's ulterior purposes were generally high, and better than those of many of his rivals. He adopted the means which he thought best suited to accomplish his ends. It would be hard to find anything more bitter than his denunciations of Buchanan and the Supreme Court for the alleged conspiracy in regard to the Dred Scott decision. Our author supports Seward in the assumption that Buchanan would not have dared to hint at the nature of the forthcoming decision, if he had not received authentic information of what that decision was to be. This assumption would be warrantable if the character of that decision had not been generally and correctly understood at least two or three days before Buchanan foretold what it would be. When, in 1858, Seward said of the Dred Scott decision (Seward's Works, iv., 595),

"The people of the United States never can, and they never will, accept principles so unconstitutional and so abhorrent. Never, never. Let the court recede. Whether it recede or not, we shall reorganize the court, and thus reform its political sentiments and practices, and bring them into harmony with the constitution and the laws of nature,"

his language was regarded as revolutionary. In February, 1860, he made a speech in the Senate which was plainly designed to put himself in harmony with the more conservative element of the party, and hence make him an eligible Republican candidate for the Presidency. He carefully avoided his former phrases about the "higher law," the "dominant class," the "Slave Power," the "irrepressible conflict"; and in place of them euphemistically spoke of the "capital [slave] States" and the "labor [free] States." After he had failed to obtain the nomination in 1860, he swung back to his radical course, and was the most brilliant figure in the ensuing campaign. We infer that the biographer does not appreciate the meaning of these changes, for he has failed to call attention to them.

The rest of Seward's public life is an open book in comparison with the part which fell between December, 1860, and April 15, 1861. Scholars do not doubt that his purposes were patriotic, but what pains Mr. Lothrop is, that they maintain that the great New Yorker made many mistakes and miscalculations and was constantly grasping for power. Every student of biography ought to know that no mistake is more common than for a leader or a central figure in a conflict to believe that the success of the cause depends upon his own supremacy. Seward was so thoroughly of this opinion that on March 8, 1861, he wrote to his wife: "I did not dare to go home, or to England, and leave the country to chance." For want of observing this trait, Seward's biographer does not understand why it is that there was so bitter a contest over the question as to who should go into Lincoln's Cabinet and control the Administration. Seward's idea was not to rule or ruin, as some have inferred, but it was to insist on holding the helm so as to prevent others from ruining the Government. Mr. Lothrop thinks, on grounds not set forth, that Seward asked to withdraw his acceptance of a position in the Cabinet because he had heard of Lincoln's remark, that if the Cabinet slate broke again it would break at the top—that is, Seward would be left out. This explanation, it should be noticed, does not explain why Lincoln made the remark, and it overlooks the very bitter recriminations which the friends of Seward and of Chase, respectively, were exchanging, and for which Lincoln believed Seward to be largely responsible.

Mr. Lothrop's chapter on Justice Campbell and the Confederate Commissioners to Washington proves that he has read so small a part of the available material printed or in manuscript that he has no appreciation of Seward's unavailing struggle to outmanœuvre both the Confederate diplomatists and the Republican radicals. If he had followed Seward's acts from day to day, as different sources of information make it possible to do, he would have seen that what Seward said to Campbell was only a part of his determination to rule the Administration and avert war. Our author is quite at sea as to Seward's motive in writing the famous suggestions of April 1, 1861, about a foreign war and a dictatorship. Wishing to defend Seward, but not being in possession of the facts, he concludes that Seward made these suggestions before he knew the President had definitively determined on the expeditions either to Fort Sumter or to Fort Pickens (p. 278). Nicolay and Hay's 'Lincoln' (vol. iii., pp. 436-37) shows, on the contrary, that on March 31 Seward bore to Scott the President's positive orders to reinforce Fort Pickens. The whole sequence of events indicates that Seward's surprising propositions were a final and desperate effort to force the Administration to let him rule, and get up a foreign war as the only means of escaping a civil one.

Considering that the diplomatic history of Seward's eight years in the Department of State has never been carefully written, much skill and industry is displayed by Mr. Lothrop in making a smooth and pleasing summary of it. Were there no unpublished dispatches which throw important light upon such as have been printed, the narrative might be called excellent although brief. We feel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confident that there are many of these dispatches which our author has not read, because he is vague and inaccurate as to several points which they fully explain. One of the best chapters is that on the *Trent* affair. If Mr. Lothrop had known just what led Seward to take the position he did, and had frankly admitted that Seward juggled with international law so as to reach an important conclusion in the way which would cause the least popular anger, he would have greatly enhanced the value of his contribution to diplomatic history. We are especially glad that he has struck an effective blow at a sentimental story which Lossing tells about an interview with Lincoln shortly after the seizure of the *Trent*. All the known facts were against this story, and Mr. Lothrop has put them in such a shape as to make an end of it. In describing Seward's refusal to receive the British and the French ministers together on a certain occasion in June, 1861, we are told (p.300) that they came "to present a joint offer of mediation." Mediation, however, was not the purpose of England and France, who had merely made up their minds to ask both the United States and the Confederacy to agree to follow certain rules adopted by the Congress of Paris in 1856.

There was an excellent opportunity for the biographer to show his powers as attorney for the defence in answering the charges about Seward's treatment of political prisoners prior to February, 1862, when he had supreme control of them. The original records are well known to be in the Department of State, and it is generally supposed that they have not been printed, but this is a mistake. We can only guess why our author has entered a brief general plea instead of making a thorough defence or explanation.

There is only one way for a biographer to do full justice to Seward and to himself: to tell the story of his life and complex character as Parton has Voltaire's, as Lewes has Goethe's, as Schurz has Clay's—fully, frankly, and without concern for results. The narrow compass of a duodecimo volume is doubtless responsible for many of Mr. Lothrop's shortcomings. Notwithstanding these, the public will be grateful for his conscientious efforts to write a popular vindication of one of the ablest, most brilliant, fascinating, energetic, ambitious, and patriotic men in American history.

GODKIN'S PROBLEMS OF MODERN DEMOCRACY.

Problems of Modern Democracy: Political and Economic Essays. By Edwin Lawrence Godkin. New York: Scribners. 1896.

ALL but the first of these essays have appeared in leading magazines during the past ten years; the first, on "Aristocratic Opinions of Democracy," was printed in the *North American Review* for January, 1865. We are thus able to trace the continuity and evolution of Mr. Godkin's views on some of the most important questions of our time. We find, in truth, more continuity than evolution, if by the latter term be implied variation. Mr. Godkin has not changed his principles since 1865; whatever change may be apparent is due merely to their application to new phases in political and social development. Whether in 1896 or in 1865, he is the unswerving supporter of liberty, reason, and individualism, and the unsparing critic of whatever tends, either by excess or insufficiency, to impair any of these.

The eleven essays deal for the most part with the great political and economical questions of the past generation. The earliest paper, written just before the conclusion of our civil war, is a defence of democracy against those critics who, following the conspicuous lead of De Tocqueville, declared democracy to be a system under which arts, science, literature, and statesmanship inevitably tend towards mediocrity, and manners towards a vulgar restlessness. Mr. Godkin, while admitting the existence of many of these defects, shows that these defects do not inhere in democracy, but spring from the conditions under which our country was expanded and settled between 1790 and 1860. In similar fashion he confutes Sir Henry Maine's assertion that popular government has a very fragile foundation by exposing the inadequacy of Sir Henry's comparison. And, indeed, it does not require a powerful logician to explode so much of Sir Henry's argument as may be expressed thus: The governments of Central and South America are unstable, owing to constant revolutions; but these governments are democratic; therefore, democracy is an unstable form of government. In a third article, called out this very summer by Mr. Lecky's 'Democracy and Liberty,' Mr. Godkin comes again to the defence of democracy, not blinking its obvious failures, but laying bare the insufficiency or irrelevancy of Mr. Lecky's data and his incorrect deductions therefrom. In each of these three apologies, Mr. Godkin's conclusions seem to us to gain greatly in weight from the fact that his attitude is avowedly that of the devil's advocate rather than that of the unquestioning champion of democracy.

"I am not an enthusiast for popular government," he says, "or for any other form of government. I believe politics to be an extremely practical kind of business, and that the communities which succeed best in it are those which bring least enthusiasm to the conduct of their affairs" (page 72). Our democracy is suffering, he says in another place, "from unforeseen evils, as well as enjoying unforeseen blessings. It will probably be worse before it is better. It is trying a great many experiments in laws and manners, of which some, doubtless, will be hideous failures. The régime of 'crazes' through which it is now passing is very discouraging, but it is engaged, like most other civilized countries, in a search after remedies" (page 308). Again, addressing himself to critics like Mr. Lecky, he very pertinently remarks, "When a monarchist or conservative begins to complain to a democrat of the defects of his system, and of the gloominess of its prospects, in order to produce any effect he must point out from what period or from what system there has been a falling away. When and where were things any better, taken as a whole? And how much better were they?" (page 283).

As illustrations of Mr. Godkin's ability to apply to special cases the general principles which we have thus sketched, we should cite his paper on "Criminal Politics," in which he describes the rise, vicissitudes, and methods of Tammany Hall, and another in which he analyzes the "Political Situation in 1896." Persons who have hitherto been reluctant to admit that the protective system has fostered the rank growth of many of the evils which now confront us, will find in the latter some stubborn facts against them. And only those who wilfully turn away from Mr. McKinley's record—first, his long patronage of silver while he was a Congressman, and next his disingenuous and cowardly avoidance of stating his position last winter and spring, while he was a candidate for the Presidency—will be apt to disagree with the opinion that Mr. McKinley's nomination marked the culmination of a thirty-year-old tendency "to eliminate men of ability and independence of thought from public life" (page 270).

Turning from political to economic subjects, Mr. Godkin's most important essay is entitled "Who Will Pay the Bills of Socialism?" With characteristic bluntness he puts point-blank the question which neither professed Socialists nor their miscellaneous coddlers and abettors have ever answered. They always talk grandiosely about a vast reservoir of wealth, which would suffice to make every man, woman, and child comfortably well off, if not rich, if Mr. Bellamy or some other philanthropic gentleman were only permitted to wave his benevolent magic wand and bid it pour forth. Wicked or heartless men—millionaires and monopolists—are supposed to be engaged in preventing the Socialist benefactors from consummating a revolution by which, in the twinkling of an eye, the very mud and cobble-stones in our streets would be turned to gold, and society would live happily ever after, like all true citizens of fairyland. Mr. Godkin disposes of these Midas dreams by showing that no such hoard exists, and that the total wealth of the United States in 1890 would, if divided per caput, and put at 6 per cent. interest, yield a per-caput return of but $6 a week—a sum ludicrously inadequate for carrying on even the cheapest of the many proposed Utopias. Hardly less important is his reiterated warning that the large numbers of men of unlimited ability, integrity, disinterestedness, and zeal—whose existence is taken for granted by the prophets of Socialism—do not now exist and never have existed. Without them, and without that imaginary hoard of wealth (*Benjamin* Kidd's Treasure, let us call it), the Socialist ship of state would hardly go faster than would the *Great Eastern* without officers, crew, and fuel.

We must speak more briefly of the rest of Mr. Godkin's book. Such papers as "Idleness and Immorality" and "The Expenditure of Rich Men" mirror the manners of our leisure class, and suggest how much mere wealth needs civilizing. Every other form of government has held out incentives by which a part at least of its leisure class have been drawn to busy themselves in worthy pursuits: will Democracy (or Plutocracy) fail to do this? Mr. Godkin considers elsewhere "The Duty of Educated Men in a Democracy," and finds that this duty can be most easily discharged by them through unremitted, intelligent, and impartial criticism. Let them not suppose, however, that the post of public critic can be held by any one: it calls for tenacity, indifference to social and partisan obloquy, disinterestedness, and clear-thinking, rare even among educated men, rarer still in happy combination. Of the two remaining essays we need only say that that on "The Economic Man" contains pungent reflections on the recent "historical schools" of economists, while that on "Some Political Aspects of the Tariff" presents a diagnosis of the effect which protection had had up to 1887 on the development of "labor" and "capital" in this country.

"If the protectionist policy is persisted in," Mr. Godkin concludes, "the process of assimilating American society to that of Europe must go on. The accumulation of capital in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hands of comparatively few individuals and corporations must continue and increase. Larger and larger masses of the population must every day be reduced to the condition of day-laborers, on fixed wages, contracting more and more the habit of looking on their vote simply as a mode of raising or lowering their wages, and, what is worse than all, learning to consider themselves a class apart, with rights and interests opposed to or different from those of the rest of the community" (page 121).

Our sole comment on this passage is that every year of the nine since it was written has but emphasized its truth.

We have said enough to give some hint of the substance of this volume. As regards the writer's style, unlike most men who since Mill have devoted themselves to the discussion in print of economics and politics, Mr. Godkin does not affect a dread of being "popular"—that is, of writing so that intelligent readers who are not specialists can understand him; he is, on the contrary, as "popular" as Mill himself, and he has even dared to imbed in his language the political slang of the time, by which he makes it all the more evident that for him politics and economics are not abstractions, but realities, manifesting themselves concretely every day. The great problems of democracy he approaches on their political or on their economic side, whereas the current fashion is to approach them from the ethical or sociological standpoint. Whoever prefers the latter will naturally cry out against the limitations of the former method. It is by no means certain that ethical considerations may not have great influence in solving every one of our present difficulties, or that some sort of socialistic state may not sooner or later be set up; but the merits of Mr. Godkin's work are not affected by these possibilities, for he has spoken so strenuously in behalf of liberty, reason, and individualism that even the enemies of those ideals must reckon with him.

SAYCE'S EGYPT OF THE HEBREWS.

The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotus. By the Rev. A. H. Sayce. Macmillan Co.

Mr. SAYCE'S book is in two pieces without visible connection. We shall confine our remarks to the first part, because there is little in the other that the author has not said before, and his unfair estimate of Herodotus has been criticised often enough by competent scholars.

Mr. Sayce begins with Abram's visit to Egypt, placing it after the Hyksos conquest, which must then have been anterior to B. C. 2350. Notice is taken of several objections to the Biblical narrative of Abram's visit and to the story of Joseph: that there were no camels in Egypt in Abram's time; that the name of Potiphar was not in use in Joseph's age; that Potiphar was a eunuch and yet married; that this story suspiciously recalls that of the "two brothers," by Enna the scribe, which some regard as the original. In discussing these, the author states the objections strongly and the argument on the other side in a very half-hearted way; which is remarkable in one who has been recently taken to task by Prof. Bevan (*Contemp. Rev.*, Dec., 1895) as an uncompromising defender of the Mosaic writings. As a result of his studies, Mr. Sayce believes (p. 49) that the Bible chronology "fits in" perfectly with that of the Egyptian monuments. The reader who knows Canon Cook's excursus on Genesis in the Speaker's Commentary may remember that Canon Cook also finds the two chronologies to tally, although Mr. Sayce's date for the Exodus is 1270 B. C., while his is 1647.

The next chapter professes to deal with Moses and the Exodus, but is mainly devoted to the tablets discovered at Tel el-Amarna. These show that Egypt, under Amenophis IV. (Khu-n-Aten), had adopted a monotheistic religion which prepared it to welcome the Hebrews in Joseph's time, while the counter-revolution which restored the ancient faith naturally led to the oppression and the Exodus. This is the best part of the book, as Mr. Sayce is perfectly at home in the field of the cuneiform inscriptions. The uninitiated will be surprised to hear that in the age of Khu-n-Aten the clumsy and difficult cuneiform was the medium of correspondence on a vast scale throughout the region between the Nile and the Euphrates.

The third chapter discusses the Exodus. The reader will agree with Prof. Petrie, that the Pharaoh of the Exodus will never be discovered by chronological computation, but only, if ever, by what further excavations may reveal. We next pass to the relations of Egypt with the Hebrews in Canaan, and then to the Israelite monarchies and their precarious position between Assyria and Egypt. We are now on historical ground, the dates are tolerably certain, and Mr. Sayce is quite at home in all that relates to Assyria. The reader will find here some interesting bits of history, and may be good-natured enough not to observe that they are wholly irrelevant. Such is the fact that under Necho (B. C. 610–594) Egyptian mariners sailing from Suez circumnavigated Africa in three years.

The age of the Ptolemies is the subject of the fifth chapter. Here the connection with the Israelites is of the very slightest—just what is involved in Egypt's occasional interference between the Jews and the rulers of Syria. We are struck here, as before, by the author's candor. He does not disguise the horrible crimes of the Maccabees, nor blink the gross formalism into which the chosen people had fallen, so that, for example, their city was regularly taken whenever their assailants knew enough to attack it on a Sabbath day. This part of the book ends with the fall of Jerusalem in B. C. 63, and with some little reference to the Christian antiquities of Egypt, in which Mr. Sayce is now greatly interested, and especially to the discovery, at Ekhmim, of the "Apocalypse of St. Peter" and the Gospel known to the early Church as that of St. Peter, in which Pilate is exonerated of all blame for the crucifixion.

We have praised Mr. Sayce for his candor, and we should prefer to make no offset to our praise; but fairness compels us to say that he occasionally relapses into professional disingenuousness. When he admits the pious frauds of the early Christian chronologists, when he owns that the Abram of Genesis xii. and the Abram of Genesis xiv. may be different persons, we admire his candor and courage. On pages 37, 38, his criticism of the story of Joseph's famine has no meaning unless the story is judged as a mere romance in which it behooves the narrator to avoid all improbability. He admits that the story betrays a later date by implying the improbable circumstance of a simultaneous famine in Palestine. And yet, with all this, he repeatedly shuts his eyes to truths which only the veriest bigot should ignore. How can so candid a writer consistently argue from a promise in Genesis and its fulfilment in Exodus xii. 40? If "forty years" in the Old Testament means, as he asserts, an indefinite number (page 91), what shall we think of the symbolic forty days in the wilderness and all the argumentative use which is made of it in the New Testament? And when Mr. Sayce, in answer to the objection that Pharaoh, as appears from Egyptian sources, was not drowned in the Red Sea, repeats the old answer that the Exodus does not say he was, does he honestly forget the usual interpretation of Psalm cxxxvi. 15, which he himself seems to accept on page 100?

Mr. Sayce's book addresses itself to "tourists and students." For the tourist it is far too learned, while the student is not likely to be pleased with a work so full of unsupported assertions. For example, we are told at the very start that the Sphinx was a mystery as early as B. C. 2350. Perhaps so; but where is the fact recorded? On page 21 we are told that naturalists have shown that the camel was not introduced into the northern coast of Africa until after the beginning of the Christian era. This point is so important that we should greatly like to be informed who these naturalists were. On page 82 we hear of a remarkable treaty between Ramses II. and the Hittite Khitasir, one item of which protects political exiles from extradition. Who would not wish to know where and in what form the treaty is preserved, and the very words of a proviso so very modern in character! On p. 106 we are told that the true form of Shishak's name is that preserved in the Old Testament. It is so paradoxical that the Egyptians should not have known the true name of the founder of their 22d dynasty that we feel entitled to demand the evidence of a fact so astonishing. For some of these statements the author may have in reserve proofs familiar to the learned; but a book intended for tourists and students is not to be defended on the principle of *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν*.

The reader will feel this lack of foundations the more as he discovers how inadequate is the author's idea of historical evidence, and how loosely he argues from it. Thus, on page 144, Mr. Sayce regards it as proved that a certain tax-gatherer did not know Greek, merely because his son wrote the tax receipts that have come down to us; as if he could have had no other reason for employing his son as a clerk. On page 68 the author of the 'Travels of a Mohar' is said to have been "clearly very proud of his geographical knowledge." Why? merely because in a book of travels he has mentioned the names of many places. On page 22, while defending the Scripture account of Abram's visit to Egypt against the objection that in Abram's day there were no camels in that country, he alleges that dromedaries' bones were dug up from the Nile mud between 1851 and 1854. He fails to show that they did not get there a thousand years after Abram's visit; but he seems quite unconscious that his argument is worthless without this link. Again, on page 110, because the prisoners represented at Karnak have, as he thinks, the faces of Amorites, he is sure that the Amorites were still strong in Palestine. The artist, we suppose, took as his models such of the captives as chanced to be at hand; it is for Mr. Sayce to show that he especially selected those who represented the majority, and this he fails to do. He does not even see that his argument proves too much, namely, that there were no Jews at all in Palestine.

Such is the looseness of Mr. Sayce's work that we are sometimes in doubt whether we are dealing with an inadequate statement or a blunder. Thus, on p. 107, we read that Shishak led his forces against Jerusalem and plundered it, and that a record of the cam-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paign was engraved on a temple at Karnak. Any reader might think that here was a valuable confirmation of Scripture, but on the very next page we have a list of the places taken, and we see with surprise that Jerusalem is not mentioned; so that, after all, the author was relying on the first book of Kings, and not on the evidence of the monuments. On p. 83 Mr. Sayce speaks of the successor of Ramses II. as the fourteenth son of that monarch and calls him Meneptah, whereas Prof. Petrie (*Contemporary Review*, May, 1896) calls him "Mery-en-Ptah (usually Merenptah)," and tells us that he was the thirteenth son. Another loose statement is found on p. 102, where we are told in what seems a general way that the Red Sea of the Authorized Version is the Gulph of Akabah. Of course, as a glance at any map will show, this is not meant to apply to the Red Sea which the Israelites crossed.

That a good deal of this looseness and inaccuracy is due to haste and lack of revision might be inferred from certain peculiarities of style and diction which we do not commonly look for in the works of learned Oxonians. Thus, on p. 45, we are told that certain excavations "have brought to light remains of the Hyksos Pharaohs, including one [one remain?] of Apopi." On p. 113 Mr. Sayce jumbles two statements, that there were no more petty princes in Egypt, and that Egypt and Ethiopia were under the same king, into this: "Egypt as well as Ethiopia obeyed a single head." On p. 123 we read that Psammetichos "had the satisfaction of seeing Egypt under a monarch who claimed to be of native race," by which the author means Psammetichos himself, whose "satisfaction" rested, we venture to say, on considerations altogether more practical if less noble. On p. 161 we are told of "a woman stained with every possible and impossible crime." In spite of all which, we are willing to believe that the spelling of the singular of *savans* as *savan*, without a "t," may be laid on the broad shoulders of the uncomplaining "typo."

The book has an index, which, though scanty, is not too inadequate to be of some use.

History of Oratory and Orators: A Study of the Influence of Oratory upon Politics and Literature, with special reference to certain orators selected as representative of their several epochs, from the earliest dawn of Grecian civilization down to the present day. By Henry Hardwicke. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896.

The History of Oratory from the Age of Pericles to the Present Time. By Lorenzo Sears. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1896.

THE title of Mr. Hardwicke's volume is misleading. It is divided into six chapters—on oratory in Greece, in Rome, in modern times, in England, in France, and in America. Dealing with these various periods and countries, it necessarily embodies much of the material for a history of oratory, but it is rather a collection of biographical sketches, quotations, and anecdotes, accompanied by a quantum of criticism, than an historical treatise. It is made up, of course, out of other books, and the process of manufacture is a little too visible. Considered as a book of anecdotes, it is entertaining, and brings together in a small compass many of the "good things" of a department of literature which is full of them, otherwise only to be hunted up by laborious research through a maze of biographies and histories.

Underlying the author's critical remarks seem to be two assumptions, one of which is no doubt true, the other, we believe, mistaken. The first is that oratory is connected with freedom. This is a commonplace: the instinct of despotism is to strangle free speech. The other assumption is that oratory and debate are very much the same. This is not true. A funeral sermon or panegyric comes under the head of oratory, but has nothing to do with debate. Oratory covers the whole field of speech addressed to any number of people large enough to be called an audience, while debate is only one branch of it. Hence rhetorical rules applicable in debate will by no means cover all oratory. When Fox said, "Did the speech read well? If so, it was a bad one," he must have had in mind extempore speech addressed to a parliamentary body for the purpose of influencing it immediately to action, and not composed at leisure to be read. Such a speech, for its full effect, must be heard by those to whom it is addressed. But it by no means follows that every speech which reads well is a bad speech. Indeed, modern public life has produced a kind of speech having nothing to do with debate, which is apt to read almost as well as it sounds when heard—we mean the orations now delivered so frequently to large public meetings on events of the day, or "issues" in a campaign, which are generally addressed to sympathetic audiences, and are now often prepared very much with a view to their effect when read in the columns of a newspaper the next morning.

Prof. Sears's manner of dealing with the subject is more elaborate than that of Mr. Hardwicke, and covers more ground, but is rather an outline sketch than a history, and even as a sketch it can hardly be called satisfactory. The author's style bears marks of an indifference to accuracy in the use of language which, in treating of an art of which language is the substance, is surprising. "Secretary of the Treasury" is a curiously modern term to apply to the office held by the orator Lycurgus, and to call Aristotle "the Rhetorician" is to apply to him a term which does not describe a writer on Rhetoric at all. There are several references to "demonstrative" oratory, but no clear description of what the author means by the term.

The book suggests, without answering, the question, how far an historical treatment of the art of oratory is possible. There are two great difficulties in the way which do not apply to other arts—first, that a large part of every oratorical style disappears and is lost with the death of the orator; second, that the materials of the art have been, during the historical period, pretty much the same in every age. In architecture, music, poetry, and painting this is not so, at any rate not to the same extent. The Taj Mahal is the same building to-day in all essential respects as when it was erected; the music of Wagner and that of Palestrina can be compared; Homer remains the same whether we believe the 'Iliad' and 'Odyssey' to be the products of one brain or of twenty-five generations; our capacity for judging of Raphael's painting is not impaired by the fact that he has been dead for centuries. But in oratory three-quarters of the art perishes with the man. His voice, manner, and action die with him, or are imperfectly preserved here and there by some auditor happily gifted with a rare power of description. What remains can be repeated, declaimed, and read, but never again spoken as it was delivered by the orator himself. The result is that in a book like Prof. Sears's we feel that we are passing in review the remains of an art rather than the art itself. We have the substance of oratory so far as it can be preserved, but three-quarters of it is now pure literature, and not oratory at all. Any history of it must deal with it as preserved; there can be no history of the evanescent part. There may be continuity, no doubt, where there is no record, and the manner of an orator of to-day may be connected by some hidden process of evolution with that of Demosthenes; but we cannot trace the connection any more than we can that between the acting of Irving and that of the fashionable tragedians at the time of Euripides. Prof. Sears mentions Hortensius, as in duty bound, but we know no more about the art of Hortensius than we do about that of Peter the Hermit, certainly one of the most effective speakers who ever lived.

The fact that the materials of the art have been, during the historical period, pretty much the same in all ages, may be an explanation of its successful study having been thus far mainly analytical, rather than historical. Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero analyze the principles which underlie the art of persuasion, and the means of persuasion have not changed since the time of Demosthenes. Human passions and human motives, and the human intellect are the same to-day as they were two thousand years ago, and hence the most striking fact about oratory is that we recognize in the great orations of antiquity all the marks of a perfected art.

Prof. Sears points out that oratory has its periods of decadence and revival, and thinks that there are signs of a revival with us at the present time. This raises an historical question which is undoubtedly of great interest—how far the condition of oratory is dependent on the condition of public life. Leaving out of view forensic and pulpit oratory, the nursery of the art is debate, and we should hardly expect to find deliberative oratory flourishing in a period of legislative decay. For the last fifty years our legislatures have steadily declined; the men sent to them have been lower and lower in character, and, what is more, legislative questions have tended to settlement, not by debate, but by private arrangement by those in control of political machines. Legislative debate and oratory have died out *pari passu* with the rise of the boss system. It would be a waste of time to debate what is not to be decided by deliberation. If we are to have a new period of oratory in public life, it must be through a higher class of men going to the legislatures and to Congress: a revival of debate among legislators unfit to debate would only make oratory ridiculous.

Pope Leo XIII. By Justin McCarthy. With a frontispiece. Frederick Warne & Co.

MR. MCCARTHY'S brief sketch and study of the reigning Pope makes a volume of 260 pages in a useful series entitled "The Ruling Men of To-day." In its paucity of dates and facts, and in the general manner of treatment, the book bears many marks of hasty and imperfect preparation. It is much the same kind of book as our campaign biographies, which have occasionally been written by men of literary ability. If Leo XIII. should read the book, it would certainly please him on the whole, not only relatively as compared with Zola's 'Rome,' but absolutely; yet he would make a great mistake if he imagined that the coming generations will take this for genuine

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history and characterization much, if any, more than Zola's novel. It is essentially a eulogy, and is saved from being literally a panegyric only by the consistency of Mr. McCarthy's political principles as an Irish home-ruler and his sympathy with the protagonists of Italian unity. A good many of his readers will probably wonder how he could subdue his convictions to the material he was working in to such a considerable degree, and some of these will fancy that they know now better than ever why he has been comparatively ineffectual in politics, seeing that a literary interest in a great cause is one thing and a moral enthusiasm for it is quite another.

An introductory chapter deals with Pius IX. A single sentence disposes of the hopes which he encouraged in 1848 and their melancholy disappointment. The dogma of infallibility, to which Pius was devoted heart and soul, is minimized as much as possible, but nothing is said to make clear how a Pope who is not infallible in the usual operations of his mind becomes so when speaking *ex cathedra*. Except for the passionate interest of Pius in the matter, we should probably never have had an infallible Pope; nor, again, if he had not long outreigned the average Pope (only eleven of all the Popes having reigned more than seventeen years).

The early life of Leo is passed over rapidly, and no explanation is given of the secret of his succession to the papal throne. In describing his personal appearance, Mr. McCarthy avails himself of varied help, most lavishly of Marion Crawford's, but he also gives his own impressions. "His face is as bloodless as that of a marble statue." No one, he tells us, has impressed him more by his appearance, not even Newman or Charles Sumner or (considerate climax!) "the late Prince Consort." But hardly does the frontispiece likeness bear out this praise, and especially is the note of saintliness on which Mr. McCarthy insists entirely wanting. It is to be hoped that the likeness is a bad one, for it is intensely disagreeable, being compact of all that is shrewdest, craftiest, foxiest in the typical ecclesiastical physiognomy.

Inheriting the *Kulturkampf* from his predecessor, Leo was involved in it from the beginning of his reign, and Mr. McCarthy discusses his attitude towards it and his dealings with it more fully than anything else; and naturally, for it was the brightest jewel in his crown to contend in a battle of diplomacy with Bismarck and win the victory. It may be granted that the *Kulturkampf* was Bismarck's great mistake, but that he was so inordinately and gratuitously silly in the business as he is here represented is too hard for belief. "Perhaps it may be owned," we read, "that for the public opinion of his generation, and of many generations afterwards, Pascal created the Jesuit." But Bismarck certainly never went to Pascal for his ideas of the contemporary Jesuit in Germany. Mr. McCarthy's account of the long and desperate struggle is interesting without being final or sufficient. Not alone the eulogists of Bismarck, but the sedate historians, will qualify to some extent this representation of Leo XIII. as the glorious defender of religious liberty.

Chapter VI., "The Empire of the Pope," adds little or nothing to the value of Mr. McCarthy's sketch. It is highly rhetorical, and it is calculated to excite rather than to allay those apprehensions of undue papal influence in political affairs which are not the exclusive property of the ignorant and the demagogues. We read: "Except as a matter of news in the daily papers, the people of the United States do not care three straws about what England and France and Germany and Russia are doing. [This is pure nonsense.] But the Papacy is an influence everywhere, and it has to look after everything." Mr. McCarthy's sympathy with republican France makes it much easier for him to defend the course of Leo in deserting the Catholic monarchists of France and sustaining the republic. He was, we are told, "always inclined to make the best of things"; a judgment to which his dealing with Italian politics seems to involve an exception of first-rate importance.

Coming to the chapter on Ireland, we are much interested in learning how Mr. McCarthy will manage a very difficult business, for "the Land League was condemned morally and socially by the Vatican," and the Land League "was in reality a strike of the tenantry against an intolerable system." To his credit be it written that he stands fast by the Land League and condemns the Pope, but he is saved from the extremest awkwardness of his dilemma by the happy circumstance that the Pope's condemnation was not delivered *ex cathedra*, and was therefore not infallible. "The sincerest affection inspired, beyond question, the condemnation, such as it was, of the Land League. But the intervention was a mistake all the same, for it was founded on imperfect knowledge and a misappreciation of the whole conditions of the political and social struggle in Ireland."

Mr. McCarthy is hardly less frank in dealing with the Pope's attitude towards the Italian Government, yet he has no word to show how much more was implicated in the taking of Rome for the Italian capital than any merely sentimental regard for the Eternal City. So political is the temper of Leo XIII. that he might have proved an excellent temporal sovereign, but in that case he would have been a striking exception to the rule—the misrule—of Papal government before his day. It is with regard to Leo's assertion of his temporal sovereignty that Mr. McCarthy's book is from first to last a neglected opportunity. The future historian will probably find in this assertion the key of his position. Evidently Leo has been as passionately devoted to his temporal sovereignty as Pius was to his infallibility. His attractions here, his repulsions there, find in it their most adequate explanation. Meantime to Italy he has shown a less friendly disposition than has any other Power. His attitude has been a source of constant irritation, alienating some from the Government, many from the Church. Mr. McCarthy has written many just things in his praise, but, when his account is finally made up, it may appear that all the good he has done, and it is much, is little in comparison with the good he might have done if he had made the best of the Italian situation by declaring, "My kingdom is not political, but spiritual."

Through the Subarctic Forest: A record of a Canoe Journey from Fort Wrangel to the Pelly Lakes and down the Yukon River to the Behring Sea. By Warburton Pike. Edward Arnold. 1896. 8vo, pp. x, 295, 17 plates and 2 maps.

THE map of the whole region traversed by Mr. Pike is on too small a scale to be quite satisfactory, and the lettering leaves us at a loss as to the real relations of the Stickine, Dease, and Liard Rivers; but if we resolve our doubts by consulting even such maps as that of British Columbia published at Victoria by the Commissioners of Lands and Works in 1895, we have no further trouble in tracing the rubricated line of our author's journey. His other map, on a scale of about 15 miles to the inch, is very clear in the region of the Pelly Lakes and eastward, where Mr. Pike's original observations enable him to make some important geographical rectifications. The main discovery thus indicated, and fully treated in the text, is that the river draining the Pelly Lakes, and marked as the Pelly on previous maps, is not the main stream, but an inconsiderable tributary of a much longer river coming from the northeast.

Mr. Pike is already known, like Caspar Whitney, as a wanderer in the Barren Grounds and a slayer of musk-oxen. Some men seem goaded on to such dangerous exploits by a spirit of unrest. They love adventure for its own sake, and almost always make readable books about their exploits; and most of us prefer to have adventures brought to us in this form, instead of going in search of them for ourselves. Mr. Pike is no exception to the average of excellence in such purveying, and has made another notable contribution to the literature of travel, though he modestly characterizes it as "a rough description of what happened in a long journey through a good game country." Some of it was over the absolutely new ground, upon which the author dwells most, in the Pelly and Liard regions, where the discoveries just mentioned were made; with this exception the route is identical, in British Columbia and the Yukon District of the N. W. T. as far down the river as Fort Selkirk, with that explored in 1887 by Dr. George M. Dawson, now Director of the Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada, whose important report was published in 1888. This is accompanied by three large route-maps, in colors, by which Pike's journey can be traced mile by mile with the greatest ease, and is a veritable mine of scientific information regarding the region of which the present volume gives us a straightforward readable account, from a traveller's point of view.

In July, 1892, Mr. Pike started from Victoria to Wrangel, where his canoe route began. He went up the Stikine, and by its tributary the Tanzilla carried over to the Dease; down this to the Liard; up the Frances, and so on by another carry to the Pelly, which he descended, and continued down the Yukon nearly to the mouth of the latter. Before reaching the sea, however, he portaged over to the Kuskokvim and went down this to salt water, finishing with a perilous piece of coasting in his canoe till he found a ship to take him to Ounalaska. He was gone more than a year; his wintering in the wilderness involved great hardship, and his must indeed have been the "lucky boat" he says she was, to have done this immense, voyaging without serious accident in the cañons and rapids he repeatedly encountered and was obliged to manage for himself. He must have been a pretty good voyageur to start with, and a first rate one at the finish. He writes mainly as the sportsman abroad, and has much to the point regarding large game, especially moose, which was found to be abundant, and seems to be rather increasing than diminishing in numbers. But what he has to say of the genus homo, both red and white, native and imported, is even more to our mind, and strikes us as very discerning. We have marked a passage as a sample of easy writing which does *not* make hard reading:

"At night we were comfortable enough, as we kept a big fire going. It was at first the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coldest man's business to put on wood, but this led to trouble, and I finally had to establish a regular watch. One of the common tricks of a winter camp is the habit men have of pretending to be sleeping, warm and snug, in the hopes of freezing some other poor devil out of his blankets to make up the fire. You can get up shaking with cold, and throw on big sticks from the wood pile, chop kindling and make as much noise as you like, yet not a soul will be sufficiently awake to lend you a hand. But as soon as the fire burns up brightly and the kettle begins to boil, the least rattle of a spoon against a tin cup will rouse the whole camp as readily as a gunshot."

The book is not quite free from infelicities, as witness Couer d'Alene for Cœur d'Alène, on p. 3; and, p.153, *Scopolax Wilsonii*, intended for *Scolopax wilsoni*, though *Gallinago delicata* is the right technical name of the bird. We also hold that Bering is better spelling than Behring for the name of the sea as well as of the person concerned. The volume is handsomely printed on smooth paper in large clear type, and has a number of good full-page illustrations, besides the two folding-maps, both done in colors.

Adeline, Countess Schimmelmann. Edited by W. Smith Foggitt. Dodd, Mead & Co.

THE ordinarily sensible person generally feels angry when he has perused a column of his newspaper, only to encounter, at the end, the flagrantly improbable announcement of a quack doctor's universal specific, winding up with "Adv." One does not have to read to the bitter end of Countess Adeline Schimmelmann's lucubrations, however, before his mental and moral stomach, so to speak, is thoroughly upset. A fairly strong taste of the quality is afforded by Mr. Foggitt's preface. In the Countess's first chapter, entitled "Childhood, and at Court," she collects all the trivial incidents of her childhood, and converts them into self-advertisements of the crudest description. When she clung to a chair, in her infantile efforts to walk, she mentions: "Thus early did I begin to evince a strong character." Of her education she says: "Nature did much more for me than all my masters," adding that she habitually did her sums "seated at the top of an old fir-tree in the park"—which may serve to explain her present toplofty ideas of herself and of her "mission," as well as her literary style. It must have been about this time that she arrogated to herself the credit for the "conversion" of a murderer. Though she never saw the man or held any communication with him, he confessed his guilt before execution, and professed religion. "My heart was filled with joy when I heard the news," she says, "and I knew that it was in answer to my prayers." Strange to say, she did not venture to mention the fact for fourteen years. It is pretty nearly the only thing she has forgotten to mention—with the trifling exception of the reason why she left the court of Berlin; why she could afford, as she alleges that she did, to contribute £900 to a society which was formed to further her "work" and collect funds for her; why, after she had, nominally, given "all she possessed" to her "work," she still had jewels, court dresses, which her brother stole, and an estate which he damaged to the extent of 21,000 crowns, in addition to the wherewithal to build and run a yacht.

The "work" which she so industriously parades is preaching to the fishermen of the Baltic, and her humility is so great that, when her brother had her incarcerated for five weeks in an insane asylum, asserting that she had been mad for nine years (or more) as the result of the morphine habit, her chief concern is, that the universe is going to swift and certain perdition because she is not at large and engaged in saving its individual and collective soul. Her descriptions of her sovereign influence over the Berlin Anarchists, before whom even the entire police force shook with fear, are equally modest. She incorporates in her book an article by Pastor Otto Funcke, called "A Home Abroad," wherein the good pastor waxes enthusiastic on the rather slender foundation of two exceedingly brief conversations with her, at an interval of several years, and a visit of a few hours to her house on the island of Rügen. The latter dates from 1890, and one wonders whether Pastor Funcke would reauthorize the account under current date after reading the portion of the book which she contributes.

She makes a loud appeal for money, but decidedly overshoots the mark when she ventures on an explicit statement of her programme for her "mission" "(1) to the fishermen of the Baltic, (2) to sailors of all nations in European ports, and (3) to the distressed and troubled elements of society everywhere." This is both too vague and too definite to act upon the sympathies of rational beings, who believe that in no department of human experience is there more need of the rare jewel, common sense, than in that of religion or pseudo-religion. The clever vagueness which leaves the limits of contributions needed for ever undefinable, suggests a sieve like capacity for absorption, and an equally sieve-like expenditure on agreeable yachting trips whose tangible results cannot be given, if any contributor is so unwise as to demand an accounting. On the other hand, the programme is too definite, because, to any thinking mind, it is altogether too ambitious, and quite beyond the powers of any one person; and there is not a hint that the Countess intends to divide the contributions with anybody else, or that she is unequal to her task. On the contrary, she says: "The success of woman's work on the Continent depends largely on the success of the mission which God has intrusted to me." She coolly ignores the existing missions for sailors in every port.

Our conclusions are based wholly on the evidence which she herself furnishes, and in absolute ignorance of her personality, or even of her name outside of the present book. Precisely what is her object in thus attempting to "get even with" her brother and others in Denmark by publishing her book in America, it is difficult to see—unless, perchance, she intends to run across the ocean in her yacht and hold out her contribution sieve to our public with her own fair hands (she assures us that she is handsome, though the portraits do not entirely bear out the assumption), as soon as the leaven of this volume has had due time to work.

Daddy Jake, the Runaway, and Short Stories Told after Dark. By "Uncle Remus" (Joel Chandler Harris). New ed. The Century Co. 1896.

The Story of Aaron (so-named), the Son of Ben Ali. Told by his Friends and Acquaintances. By Joel Chandler Harris. Illustrated by Oliver Herford. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1896.

A PURE coincidence, surely, brings out together a new edition of 'Daddy Jake' and a first edition (may there be many) of 'The Story of Aaron.' They are both snatches of that "Life among the Lowly" which Mrs. Stowe was not the first to depict under the veil of romance, and Mr. Harris will not be the last. In other words, they take their place on the shelf beside 'Archy Moore' and 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' but with the capital moral and historic distinction that they are the product of a Southern pen.

The art of 'Daddy Jake' was admirable, but the mechanism was all terrestrial and human. It opened directly and in the most matter-of-fact way with "an uproar on the Gaston plantation, in Putnam County, in the State of Georgia," "one fine day in September, in the year 1863." This plantation "lay along the Oconee River" "not far from Roach's Ferry." Uncle Jake, the carriage-driver, strikes and thinks he has killed the overseer, who presumes to give him orders and to assault him, and, fearful of the consequences, takes to the woods. Dr. Gaston's young children, Lucien and Lillian, go in quest of him in a bateau let drift down the Oconee. In 'The Story of Aaron' we are still "on a large plantation in middle Georgia," but Lucien and Lillian are transformed into our classic friends Buster John and Sweetest Susan, with their back-door relations with "Mr. Thimblefinger's queer country," while Daddy Jake gives place to Aaron, the offspring of an Arab slave-hunter who was properly punished by being confounded with the Africans he was marketing, and an Arab girl who shared the same fate and was transported with him to this country. Aaron shows his pedigree in his carriage and in his spirit, was early regarded and treated as a "dangerous nigger," and later passed for a conjurer among his fellow-slaves In fact, Brer Rabbit had directed Buster John and Sweetest Susan to him to learn the language of animals, and, this acquired, the story of Aaron is most cleverly pieced out in turn by the subject of it himself, by the gray pony, the track dog, the white pig, the black stallion, and by Free Polly.

We do not mean to spoil the pleasure of younger or older readers by revealing the plot. Aaron, too, becomes a runaway, and seeks refuge in the swamp, the lair of the white pig. The aspects of slavery which Mr. Harris incidentally displays are the slave coffle, the slave auction, the oppression of small proprietors by large slave-owners, and lynch law in operation upon an abolitionist, along with the passion of the Southern temperament and its instinctive resort to the shot gun whether for good or for evil purposes. In the end, the rescue of the abolitionist, before the war, redounds to the security of the Abercrombie plantation when Sherman passes that way on his march to the sea, and the great General figures in the narrative like any other personage, but in the unwonted light (in Southern eyes) of a benefactor. The story is neither as dramatic nor as pathetic as "Daddy Jake," but the skill of it is consummate, and its fidelity to the life not inferior, while its supernatural element will perhaps render it more attractive to that imaginative age which can make a happy family of "Ole Brer Tarrypin," Tecumseh Sherman, and "Miss Meadows and de gals."

Die Maya-Sprachen der Pokom-Gruppe. Zweiter Teil. Die Sprache der K'e'kchí Indianer. Nebst einem Anhang: Die Uspanteca. Von Dr. Med. Otto Stoll, Zurich. Leipzig: K. F. Köhler. 1896. 8vo, pp. viii, 221.

AMONG the Central American regions Yuca-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tan and Guatemala were the first to attract preeminently the attention of the Spanish conquerors on account of their dense population and great fertility. The inhabitants were found to belong to one race or family, and when the whites began to learn their languages, these proved to belong to one common stock; the Maya and the K'iché being the most widespread among them all. At an early period grammars, dictionaries, and devotional books were composed in them, but the real number of the Maya dialects was not known until recently, when exploring linguists fixed it at sixteen. The Huaxtec, representing the most archaic forms, is spoken in the Mexican States of Vera Cruz and Hidalgo, the Tsendal in Chiapas; but the majority of the smaller dialects are heard in Guatemala.

Maya proper has been the object of a more extensive literary culture than all the other dialects taken together, and this had certainly its cause in the large literary productiveness of the people along the coast long before the Spanish armies put an end to paganism. The Maya dialects are remarkable for the brevity and conciseness of their diction, the tendency to monosyllabism, and the suave, well-sounding pronunciation. The verbal paradigms are short, the tenses and moods well defined; the multiplicity of the personal pronouns forms a curious contrast to the pregnant and laconic brevity of all other grammatic forms, while the lexicon is as rich in vocables as that of any other American tongue. No modern scientist has shed more light upon the structure of the Maya dialects than Edward Seler, whose writings on Nahuatl ethnography and language are also as yet unsurpassed. The epigraphic relics of the Maya nations or tribes are likely to take us back, when correctly understood, to a period of American history further remote than that of any other aboriginal people.

But to advance our knowledge the study of the dialects must go hand in hand with that of the stone inscriptions and the codices, and in furtherance of this purpose Prof. Dr. Otto Stoll of Zurich, who explored Guatemala from 1878 to 1883, has published grammars and vocabularies of Íxil, Pokonchí, and Pokomam. To these he has added in the present year a bulky volume on the K'e'kchí dialect (grammar, dictionary, phraseology), spoken on the highland in the central parts of the republic. This book forms volume second of his series on the Pokom group, which consists of the following dialects: Pokonchí, Pokomám, K'e'kchí, and Uspantec. At present this dialect is spoken by about 85,000 Indians. Its most striking characteristic is an excessive abrasion or grinding down (*Verschleifung*) of grammar forms, and this gives it the appearance of being recently formed as compared with the more archaic languages of the Kiché group. Indeed, many K'e'kchí forms can be morphologically explained only by comparing them with the older and more explicit forms of Cakchiquel and Kiché, especially as regards the verbs derived by suffixion.

The grammar occupies 122 pages of the book, and is the result of a thorough comparative study of all the dialects accessible to the author, spoken in Guatemala or in the States adjoining. The syntactic examples are spread over five pages only, the dictionary extends from p. 128 to p 191, the remainder of the volume being taken up by the Uspantec dialect, which at present is limited to one solitary town. In former writings Stoll had placed it with the K'iché group, but, after a clearer insight into its peculiarities, he now classifies it with the Pokom dialects. These peculiarities refer to the verbal inflection; but if we base our judgment upon the lexicon only, Uspantec would stand just as near to the K'iché as to the Pokom dialects, for in the course of centuries Uspantec became separated from its original congeners further west, and borrowed many terms from the K'iché Indians who had meantime become immediate neighbors.

The Great Rift Valley; Being the Narrative of a Journey to Mount Kenya and Lake Baringo. By J. W. Gregory. With maps and illustrations. London: J. Murray; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. 8vo, pp. xxi, 422.

THE expedition of which this attractive volume is the description was remarkable for several reasons. Purely scientific in its objects, its leader a British Museum official without previous African experience, unprecedentedly small and imperfectly equipped, it accomplished more in the same length of time than any other recorded African expedition. The territory of the most hostile savages of East Africa was traversed without bloodshed, and the severest hardships from cold, hunger, thirst, and rapid marching were endured with the loss of but a single porter. Though upon the leader, being without a white companion, fell all the burden of the care of the caravan, he made numerous valuable scientific observations, as well as, to quote Sir William Flower, "a very important collection of rocks, fossils, and zoölogical and botanical specimens." This probably unequalled record was due to Dr. Gregory's courage and endurance, but especially to his tactful and sympathetic treatment of his men, who in consequence served him faithfully.

He left the coast in March, 1893, and followed the line of the projected Uganda railway as far as the Rift Valley, where he turned northward to Lake Baringo. On his return march he made a détour to examine the glaciers of Mount Kenya, and reached Mombasa in August, having travelled 1,650 miles in a little less than five months. Notwithstanding the fact that he was nearly all the time on ground familiar to the student of African exploration, with the exception of the few days spent in unsuccessful attempts to reach the summit of Kenya, his personal narrative is unusually fresh and interesting. There are numerous bright and often humorous sketches of life in camp and on the march, and graphic descriptions of noteworthy scenes and incidents. The most important contribution to our knowledge of the region traversed is to be found in the observations upon the Rift Valley. The character of this extraordinary fissure in the earth's surface, which begins at the Lebanons and ends at Lake Nyassa, can best be realized by Dr. Gregory's description of it near the equator. He was marching over a plain covered with thin scrub when, "suddenly, without the slightest warning, I found myself on the edge of a precipice 1,900 feet in height. For some hundreds of feet the cliff was absolutely vertical." At the base of the precipice was a long, narrow lake of an exquisite blue color, "broken by the green of dense growths of alga, or by pink where vast flocks of flamingoes floated on the surface." A series of terraces, like a vast amphitheatre, rising to the summit of a mountain, formed its opposite shore, while twenty miles distant rose the precipitous western valley wall.

The geological history of the earth movement which formed this valley, so far as examination revealed it, is told in the second half of the volume. Here are also general chapters on the physical geography, fauna and flora, and native races, frequently enlivened by illustrative anecdotes of adventure. At the time of Dr. Gregory's expedition the big game was almost destroyed by the cattle disease, but in some places lions and elephants were "still so numerous as to be a serious plague to the inhabitants." Several remarkable instances of protective mimicry are described, one of which, a group of insects so arranged as to resemble a spike of flowers, is beautifully represented in the frontispiece. There is also an admirable characterization of the Zanzibari porter, much berated by most travellers, but for whose endurance and faithfulness Dr. Gregory has no scant praise. He tells, for instance, of one of his men who was willing to die in the snow of Kenya rather than to leave his load "without my master's order." At another time, after they had been without water for forty hours, his headman refused to take his share of a scanty supply, and gave it to the porter who seemed most overcome by thirst. "Later on, I asked him how he had denied himself. He said: 'It was nothing! I've seen Bula Matari (Stanley) do the same thing lots of times, and if he could do it, Inshallah! so can I.'" The closing chapter treats of the future prospects of this part of the British Empire, which our author regards as apparently without great mineral or agricultural wealth, and as unsuited to white colonization, yet certain, under patient and wise rulers, to become the abode of a peaceful and industrious native population. A list of plants collected is supplied in an appendix, and there are several useful indexes, some interesting illustrations, and two excellent maps.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barnes, Mary S. Studies in Historical Method. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 90c.
Biddle, A. J. D. The Madeira Islands. Philadelphia: Drexel-Biddle & Bradley.
Cannan, Edwin. Lectures by Adam Smith on Justice, Police, Revenue, and Arms. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan.
Captain Cook's Voyages Round the World. T. Nelson & Sons. $2.
Crawford, F. M. Taquisara. 2 vols. Macmillan. $2.
Drinkwater, Jennie M. Dolly French's Household. Philadelphia: A. J. Rowland. $1.25.
Duruy, Victor. A History of France. 2 vols. T. Y. Crowell & Co.
Everett-Green, Evelyn. Olive Roscoe. T. Nelson & Sons $1 75.
Farnell, Ida. The Lives of the Troubadours. London: David Nutt.
Fiske, J. The American Revolution. Illustrated. [Holiday Edition.] 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co $8.
Guerber, H. A. Märchen und Erzahlungen für Anfänger Zweiter Teil. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 65c.
Hale, W. T. Showers and sunshine. Memphis, Tenn.: Gayoso Bookstore.
Hatfield, Prof J. T. Materials for German Composition. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 12c.
Jewett, Sarah O. The Country of the Pointed Firs. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1 25.
Kopta, F. F. Bohemian Legends, and Other Poems. 2d ed. W. R. Jenkins.
Le Baron, Grace. The Rosebud Club. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 75c.
Morrison, Sarah E. Chilhowee Boys at College. T. Y. Crowell & Co. $1.50.
Osborne, Francis. Advice to a Son. New ed. London: David Nutt.
Phelps, Elizabeth S. Chapters from a Life. Boston; Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Sloane, Prof. W. M. Life of Napoleon Bonaparte. Vol. I. Century Co. $8.
Smith, E. B My Village. Scribners. $2.
Some More Nonsense. London: Gardner, Dalton & Co.
The American Digest. 1896. St. Paul: West Publishing Co.
Theuriet, André. Rustic Life in France. T. Y. Crowell & Co. $2.50.
Thompson, E. E. Studies in the Art Anatomy of Animals. Macmillan. $10.
Thomson, Prof. Arthur. A Handbook of Anatomy for Art students. Macmillan. $5.
Thoreau, H. D. Cape Cod. [Holiday Edition.] 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $5.
Wakeman, H. O. An Introduction to the History of the Church of England. macmillan. $2.
Watson, E. H. L. The Unconscious Humorist, and Other Essays. London: Elkin Mathews; New York: G. H. Richmond & Co.
Wells, H. G. The Wheels of Chance: A Bicycling Idyll. Macmillan. $1.50.
Wiggin, Kate D. Marm Lisa. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED